

INHERITANCE, INCLUSION, AND IDENTITY IN TOBIT AND THE JEWISH DIASPORA

Throughout the Hebrew Bible, “inheritance” is a ubiquitous and important theme. Although “inheritance” terms are utilized by various biblical writers to convey a range of realities, the use of such terms is consistently applied to a streamlined thematic concept: God gathered for himself a people, and he gifted those people with an allocation of land on which they might live and thrive, land on which they might obey God and worship him exclusively ¹. It is in the land of Israel that God interacted with his people, blessed them, and kept them secure. The land is described as a gift from God (Deut 4,1), which God cared for and watched over (Deut 11,10-12). Israelite identity was tied to the land in ways not relevant to their life outside of it. An oft-neglected aspect of land studies is recognition that the land was not simply one gift among many, but it was a certain kind of gift — an inheritance ². The Israelites believed that they had not simply received the land from God but inherited it, and this belief had a significant impact on shaping the way that the Israelites viewed the land, the way that they viewed their relationship to God, and the shape of their religious and social identity. Christopher J.H. Wright effectively argues that of principal importance for inheritance is the father-son relationship between God and his people, which is manifested at both the national (Exod 4,22; Deut 32,5-6.18-19; Hos 11,1; Jer 31,9) and individual (Deut 14,1) level. Israel’s sonship is indicated by their election, as they were brought into existence by God and chosen by him for his own possession. Vital to understanding the primary term for inheritance, נחלה, is that it signifies the

¹ The noun נחלה and verbal forms from the root נחל are the main words for inheritance in the Hebrew Bible. The noun is used 220 times, and the verb is used 59 times. In the LXX, the primary Greek terms for inheritance include the noun κληρονομία, and the verbal form κληρονομέω. The Greek terms in the LXX coincide closely with the usage of Hebrew terms; their usage serves to demonstrate the way that נחלה was received in interpretations of the Hebrew texts, and demonstrates that, when interpreting inheritance in both Hebrew and the LXX, נחלה and κληρονομία function in a relatively synonymous fashion. For more on statistics and translations, see *NIDNITE* (ed. M. SILVA) (Grand Rapids, MI 2014) 2:693-696.

² See, for example, W.D. DAVIES, *The Gospel and the Land*. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine (Berkeley, CA 1974). In this seminal study on the land, Davies mentions inheritance just once, and that in a footnote (*The Gospel and the Land*, 20 n. 12). In the note Davies admits that inheritance is an important theme, inseparable from discussions of the land, and yet he pays no further attention to it.

unique relationship between God and his people³. The evidence suggests that נחלה has an essentially *relational* character.

In many ways, the post-exilic period brought about shifts in Israelite/Jewish identity. The Israelites' relationship to the land became tentative and unstable, and this instability forced them to seek out fresh ways to relate to God and to one another while simultaneously confirming their commitment to their heritage and traditions. This holds true for the use of inheritance terms. Despite the instability of their place in the land, it was vital to the Jewish people that their relationship with God continue. Inheritance language is tied to God's relationship with his people and his favor towards them. For Jews in the diaspora, their inability to inherit landed property in Israel does not stop the practice of God granting to them inheritances; it simply changes the timing of the reception of their inheritances, or the referent of the types of things to be inherited. The application of the terms and the content and referents to inheritance vary from one post-exilic text to another, depending on a number of social factors and the theological concerns of the writer(s) and communities behind the production of each text. These factors have produced unique and even anomalous uses of inheritance terms which still share the common goal of reinforcing God's favor for his people despite their geographic circumstances.

Tobit is among the group of post-exilic texts that makes frequent use of inheritance terms. The purpose of this paper is to analyze inheritance terms in Tobit in order to understand the ways in which the writer's usage is rooted in Israel's history and antecedent Jewish traditions, as well as the ways in which the writer appropriates these terms in fresh directions for the purposes of reflecting the social conditions of the audience of the text. In section one, inheritance terms and concepts in Tobit are analyzed. Then, section two offers proposals for the sorts of social conditions faced by many Jews in the post-exilic period that might have had an impact on Tobit's use of terms and on the writer's understanding of inheritance concepts.

I. INHERITANCE IN THE BOOK OF TOBIT

Tobit is principally concerned with the plight of Israel and its ultimate fate in the post-exilic dispersion. The book deals primarily with individuals,

³ C.J.H. WRIGHT, *God's People in God's Land*. Family, Land, and Property in the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 20, states: "It emerges, therefore, that the gift of the land, as a historical indicative which owes nothing to the action or merit of Israel, is directly related to the same unconditional feature of Israel's sonship; it is because Israel is Yahweh's firstborn son that the land is given as an inheritance. The bond between Israel's land theology and the status of the people's unique relationship with Yahweh is here seen at its closest — the one being, as it were, the tangible manifestation of the other".

but the story of the characters parallels that of the nation, and the final two chapters of the book assure the reader that the problem of exile and dispersion are foremost on the writer's mind, as is the eschatological hope for the regathering of God's people into a newly constituted Jerusalem ⁴. The book is post-exilic, but Tobit's understanding of the exile is strongly influenced by the Pentateuch and Deuteronomic theology ⁵. The book opens with an appeal to tribal social identity: Tobit's family is of the tribe of Naphtali (1,1), and the writer makes consistent use of narratives from the Pentateuch. The God of Tobit is the creator of the world (3,11), the God of Israel (3,3-5), and the God of the law of Moses (6,13). Importantly for our purposes, Tobit presents God as a father and Israel as his children (13,3-4). God's providence is a major theme, as is the trust of the characters in God's providence throughout the story. Inheritance terms appear in Tobit six times, and, as we shall see, in nuanced ways each of these is rooted in the Pentateuch as well as influenced by the social changes among the Israelites during the exile ⁶. All six occurrences build on a single plotline, which requires a survey of the uses of inheritance within the story before offering an analysis.

In Sarah's prayer to God in chapter 3, she laments her life, particularly how each of her seven husbands was killed by the demon Asmodeus. After contemplating suicide, Sarah recognizes that to die would be to deprive her father of an heir (κληρονομήσει, 3,15), and yet she desires death. In hearing Sarah's prayer, God determines that she should marry Tobit's son Tobias, and that Tobias should "inherit her" (κληρονομήσαι αὐτήν, 3,17). In a parallel story, Tobit, unaware of God's plan, gives instructions

⁴ See G. NICKELSBURG, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishna*. A Historical and Literary Introduction (Minneapolis, MN 2011) 33.

⁵ See the detailed article by A.A. DI LELLA, "The Deuteronomic Background of the Farewell Discourse in Tob 14:3-11", *CBQ* 41 (1979) 380-389, where he argues primarily for the strong ties between Deuteronomy and the final chapter of Tobit, but also comments that "[a] careful reading of Tobit will show that Deuteronomy provided background material for much of the rest of the book".

⁶ In Greek, Tobit is extant in two recensions. The longer form contains roughly an additional 1,700 words. In his critical edition, R. HANHART, *Text and Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 3/139; MSU 17; Göttingen 1984) 21-37, designates the shorter form G^I, and the longer form G^{II}. These designations have been taken up by most scholars. Although most major manuscripts contain G^I, the majority of scholars regard G^{II} as closer to the original for at least two reasons. First, the shorter renderings of passages in G^I appear to be condensed forms of G^{II}'s content, rather than the reverse. Second, the Cave IV fragmentary texts of Tobit from Qumran (four in Aramaic, one in Hebrew) largely agree with the longer form of the Greek text. For a brief overview, see the introduction of A.A. DI LELLA's translation of Tobit in *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford 2009) 456-458. For the reasons stated by Di Lella, most recent translations follow the longer form of the Greek text. This paper follows G^{II} wherever possible, and cites material from G^I in places where G^{II} has no parallel, such as Tob 4,12.

to his son Tobias and commands him to marry someone from among the descendants of his ancestors, rather than a foreign (ἄλλοτρίαν) woman. Tobit clarifies that a foreign woman is any woman that is not specifically from their own tribe of Naphtali, and he then references the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as those who took wives from among their own kindred. Because their forefathers obeyed this principle, they were blessed with children, who “will inherit the land/earth” (κληρονομήσει γῆν, 4,12).

In chapter 6 Tobias travels with the angel Raphael, who tells Tobias that they are to stay at the home of Raguel, who is a relative. There, Tobias will meet Raguel’s daughter Sarah. Because Tobias is their next of kin, he has a hereditary claim on Sarah and so should marry her, receiving her as an inheritance (κληρονομήσαι αὐτήν, 6,12). This will also give Tobias the right to inherit Sarah’s family’s possessions (6,13)⁷. As the book ends, Tobias and Sarah have been married, and after their parents die, Tobias inherits (ἐκληρονόμησεν) both family estates (14,13).

Inheritance terminology in Tobit is tied in significant ways to one of the major plotlines of the book: Sarah’s desire to obtain an heir and preserve her father’s estate. Questions surrounding this plotline have led some scholars to find the roots of the book’s view of inheritance in the Pentateuch. The first question considers the need of Tobias to marry a woman from within his own tribe. Tobit’s request leads to a second question which is related to the first; Tobit is not the only character in the story who regards marriage within a tribe as the norm. The angel Raphael suggests Sarah as a wife for Tobias on these same grounds, and in fact refers to such a union as obligatory. Raphael roots this obligation directly in the law of Moses and pronounces the requirement of the death penalty against Raguel if he were to deny the union (6,12-13). Furthermore, Raguel expresses his support for the marriage as an obligation based on the law of Moses (7,10-14).

Difficulty arises when one seeks to substantiate the obligation of tribal marriage in the law itself. Tobit asks that Tobias not marry a “foreign” woman, making use of the term ἄλλοτρίαν (4,12). Although the Hebrew Bible does contain prohibitions against intermarriage, and some of these

⁷ In verse 12, G^I states only that Tobias will inherit Sarah’s family estate, but it says nothing about Sarah herself being an inheritance for Tobias. Conversely, G^{II} states that Tobias will inherit both Sarah and her father’s possessions. G^{II} is supported by 3,17, where Tobias inherits Sarah herself. G^I is best viewed as a condensed version of G^{II}, where one of the occurrences of the infinitive form κληρονομήσαι has been edited out. Verse 13 features the noun form of κληρονομία, which is either a reference to Sarah, or to her father’s possessions, or to both; or possibly it refers to Tobias’ hereditary right to marry Sarah over other possible suitors.

prohibitions feature the use of the term ἀλλοτρίαν in the LXX to describe foreign women, these prohibitions all refer to an Israelite marrying a non-Israelite⁸. Tobit here refers to his fellow Israelites as “foreign”, a reference that has no grounds in the Hebrew Bible. Although the use of ἀλλοτρίαν is peculiar, Tobit grounds his request in an appeal to the patriarchs, who did practice marriage within their paternal kin-group⁹, but this does not explain the book of Tobit’s understanding that the practice is rooted in the law¹⁰.

Carey A. Moore argues that the foundation is found in levirate marriage (Deut 25,5-10)¹¹, but he does not detail the important differences between levirate marriage and Sarah’s situation. The law states that, if a man dies, his brother must marry the widow to provide an heir for the deceased. Tobit does not detail any relationship between Tobias and Sarah’s previous husbands; it is the kinship between Tobias and Sarah herself that is the grounds for the obligation in the story, and the concern for an heir lies not with Sarah’s deceased husbands but with her father. These details do not match the conditions of levirate marriage. The story in Tobit shares far more parallels with that of Ruth and Boaz (Ruth 4,1-12), which Moore himself argues is not necessarily an example of levirate marriage¹². Eryl W. Davies defines levirate marriage more loosely, to include any marriage where members of a kin-group marry to perpetuate the name and estate of a male relative¹³. This is certainly the case in Tobit, but it is not clear that the law for levirate marriage is in view.

⁸ See, for example, Gen 28,1-2; Exod 34,16; Deut 7,3-4; Ezra 9,2,12; Neh 10,30; 13,25. The term ἀλλοτρίαν is used to describe foreign women in Ezra 10,2 and Neh 13,27, with both passages referring to Gentiles and concerned with maintaining cultural and religious purity from non-Israelite influence.

⁹ See C.A. MOORE, *Tobit* (AB 40A; New York 1996) 169, for details of these marriage relationships.

¹⁰ S.J. GATHERCOLE, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids, MI 2002) 39, points out that, although Tobit features ritual identity markers such as endogamy, obedience to Torah is not typically defined by such markers, placing the emphasis instead on sacrificial offerings such as almsgiving. This leaves an ambiguity as to how identity markers are grounded in Torah.

¹¹ MOORE, *Tobit*, 203.

¹² MOORE, *Tobit*, 203.

¹³ See E.W. DAVIES, “Inheritance Rights and the Hebrew Levirate Marriage”, VT 31 (1981) 138-144, who argues in favor of Ruth and Boaz as an example of a levirate marriage based on the need for a perpetuation of a family name and estate as the key to any levirate marriage. Under this definition the law applies to any male in need of an heir, and Raguel would fit that definition. Although Davies’ view takes into consideration the “spirit” or “intent” of the law, it does not take careful note of the precise conditions for levirate marriages described by Deut 25,5-10. For an account of the differences between the levirate marriage law and the story of Ruth and Boaz, see D.W. MANOR, “A Brief History of Levirate Marriage as it Relates to the Bible”, RQ 27 (1984) 129-142, here 136-138.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer argues that the appeal to the law likely stems from the case of the daughters of Zelophehad in Num 27,1-11 and 36,1-13, but, like Moore, he does not consider the important differences between that situation and the one found in Tobit. Fitzmyer argues that the daughters of Zelophehad were required to marry within their tribe so that their inheritance would remain within it, and that Raguel would have seen Sarah's obligation in much the same way ¹⁴. However, the case of the daughters of Zelophehad was not concerned with inheritance in all aspects, but only with the inheritance of land that was allotted to tribes and families as a result of the conquest. Zelophehad's daughters were concerned that they would lose their specific allotment in the land of promise, and a law was created to ensure that it would remain within their family. The stipulation was added that they must marry within their tribe so that the overall tribal allotments would not shrink or grow due to death or intermarriage ¹⁵. The remaining possessions and estate of a family are not in view in Numbers 27 and 36, and as Raguel and Sarah are exiles living in the diaspora, it is possible, but unlikely, that their concern is with their ancestral allotment back in Israel. In the case of Fitzmyer's suggestion, it is unclear why individual family possessions would need to remain within a given tribe, a distinction that Fitzmyer overlooks ¹⁶.

The difficulty of rooting the obligation of inter-tribal marriage in the law is compounded by Raphael's suggestion that for Raguel to deny such

¹⁴ J.A. FITZMYER, *Tobit* (Berlin 2003) 212. See also T. HIEKE, "Endogamy in the Book of Tobit, Genesis, and Ezra-Nehemiah", *The Book of Tobit*. Text, Tradition, Theology (eds. G. XERAVITS – J. ZSENGELLÉR) (JSJSup 98; Leiden 2005) 103-119.

¹⁵ This case appears to set a new legal precedent within the community, as a command goes out prioritizing the recipients of an inheritance in cases where a man dies with no male heir. Priority is based on family proximity: first the daughters inherit, and if a man has no daughter then it transfers to his brothers, and finally the nearest kinsman of his clan (Num 27,8-11). This arrangement guarantees a man's inheritance and prioritizes family lineage in all cases. Due to the strict border arrangements given to clans and tribes by God, the arrangement providing Zelophehad's inheritance to his daughters concerned the leaders of the tribe of Manasseh, from which Zelophehad's family derived. If a woman marries outside of her own tribe, patriarchy required that the woman become a member of her husband's tribe. If the daughters of Zelophehad were to marry outside of Manasseh, then Zelophehad's share of the tribal inheritance would go with them, decreasing Manasseh's tribal inheritance decreed by God and increasing the share of another tribe (Num 36,5). Moses then shares this concern and decrees that an inheritance cannot transfer between tribes; if a female heir is to maintain her inheritance she must be required to marry within her own tribe (Num 36,8-9). Although progeny was the primary criterion in the decision of Numbers 27 to give Zelophehad's inheritance to his daughters, in Numbers 36 progeny is secondary to the tribal land allotments decreed by God.

¹⁶ FITZMYER, *Tobit*, 172, states that marrying within the tribe would ensure "Tobit's solidarity with his family, clan, and tribe", but he does not explain how this is connected to the law. The distinction between tribal land allotments and ancestral property more generally is also missed by HIEKE, "Endogamy", 106.

a union would incur upon him the death penalty. No such prescription can be found anywhere in the law, or the rest of the Hebrew Bible for that matter. Recognizing this difficulty, Fitzmyer suggests that this stipulation “undoubtedly attests a later Jewish interpretation of such a biblical prescription”¹⁷. This suggestion is apt, and might be instructive for the book of Tobit’s entire presentation on inter-tribal marriage. Even if such a thing is not prescribed by the law, the practice of marrying within the kin-group is grounded in the patriarchs, and the situation in Tobit certainly bears many important similarities to levirate marriage, the marriage of the daughters of Zelophehad, and other ancient examples of endogamy. As Moore points out, both exogamy and endogamy have been practiced throughout Israel’s history at given times, with the motivation for one or the other often decided by the social conditions in which the Israelites found themselves¹⁸. It is reasonable to understand the views of inter-tribal marriage expressed in the book of Tobit as an example of an exilic-era interpretation of Pentateuchal circumstances. Chief among these is likely to be the patriarchal practice of marrying within the kin-group, as that is the practice to which Tobit appeals. Maintaining close inter-tribal bonds, so far as it was possible, would have been particularly important in the exilic era to maintain national and religious order for Jews separated from the land of Israel. The fact that Tobit is concerned not only with ethnic purity but also tribal purity may in fact be motivated by the land inheritance, and therefore Numbers 27 and 36 may also lie in the background of Tobit’s interpretation. The book of Tobit ends with the expectation that the Jews would return to the promised land, and the allocation of that land may still motivate tribal purity for some Jews in the diaspora. Regardless of the specifics, the most reasonable approach views Tobit’s presentation of inter-tribal marriage as a culturally developed interpretation of various laws and narratives found in the Pentateuch, rather than as a precise application of particular laws¹⁹.

¹⁷ FITZMYER, *Tobit*, 214.

¹⁸ MOORE, *Tobit*, 169.

¹⁹ It is difficult to determine precisely what many Second Temple texts are referring to when they discuss obedience and Torah observance. Does this include, in a narrow sense, the observance of specific laws? Does this include the interpretation and application of narratives and the lives of figures in Israel’s past? Is this even limited to the Pentateuch alone, or does it include modes of discourse regarding Torah across various interpretive traditions? It has been observed that the Second Temple wisdom tradition redefined law observance and the nature of disobedience. Tobit is a prime example of this phenomenon. See, for example, the comments by S.J.D. COHEN, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Louisville, KY 2006) 67, who argues that Tobit went to Jerusalem for the feasts and observed the food laws, but when instructing his son, he ignores the ritual laws and instead emphasizes the importance of charity and morality. See also A.B. PERRIN, “An Almanac of Tobit

There are two other important issues regarding inheritance in Tobit that require discussion. The first concerns the references to Sarah as an inheritance for Tobias (3,17; 6,12). A marriage union as a referent for inheritance is a unique usage. On the surface, inherit appears to function as a synonym for “receive”, but two important considerations connect this marriage with the theology of inheritance. First, Tobias’ reception of Sarah as his wife is associated with his inheritance of her ancestral estate (6,12-13). The parallel usage of terms implies that Tobias’ reception of Sarah and her father’s estate should be viewed in a synonymous way — as inheritances. Second, Raguel states that Sarah is being given to Tobias specifically as a gift from God himself (7,11)²⁰. For Jews in the diaspora, their inability to inherit landed property in Israel does not stop the practice of God granting to them inheritances; it simply changes the referent of the types of things to be inherited. Inheritance language is tied to God’s relationship with his people and his favor towards them. Sarah’s prayer for God’s intervention in chapter 3 leads to his response in the form of a unique mode of inheritance, in this case, a marriage union that perpetuates Sarah’s family line. The marriage union between Tobias and Sarah not only grants an inheritance within Sarah’s family, but the union itself is an inheritance granted to Tobias, demonstrating God’s favor towards them. This mode of inheritance highlights the theme of God’s providence in the story.

This does not mean that landed property as an inheritance is foreign to Tobit. The final issue involving inheritance that merits attention concerns the phrase “will inherit the land/earth” (κληρονομήσει γῆν) in 4,12. The term κληρονομήσει is a collective singular referring to the offspring of the patriarchs as those who *will inherit*. The verb is in the future tense. While it is possible that Tobit is referring to the more immediate offspring of the patriarchs, those that inherited the promised land after the conquest, and that the future tense verb implies a future inheritance *for them* (meaning the patriarchal generations), it is important to note that Tobit ends with an eschatological expectation for the return of the Jews to a reconstituted Israel. From the perspective of the book of Tobit, the diaspora Jews are not in possession of the land; therefore the promise of the inheritance of the land is not yet realized²¹. In Tobit’s view, the

Studies: 2000-2014”, *CBR* 13 (2014) 107-142, here 130, who writes: “Given this situation, it is conceivable that the aforementioned strategies for advancing endogamy indicate that the author of Tobit participated in a Mosaic discourse of halakhic interpretation and extension”.

²⁰ See FITZMYER, *Tobit*, 233, who points out that the verse is theologically passive: God gifts Sarah to Tobias.

²¹ The historical displacement of the narrative is an important factor when analyzing the future tense κληρονομήσει. Three levels of history factor into Tob 4,12: (1) the patriarchs

Israelites were exiled due to their own rebellion against the commands of God (3,3-5). Tobit's final prayer calls for God's mercy, recognizing his fatherhood over his people Israel (13,1-5). Tobit calls for God's people to acknowledge him (13,8-10), and then turns his attention to the Gentiles, who will come from all over the earth, bearing gifts for God and praising him in Jerusalem (13,11). Tobit imagines the reconstituted Israel as a city built with gold and precious jewels where God will be worshipped forever (13,16-17). In Tobit's final council to Tobias, he expresses his confidence in this eschatological reality where the Israelites are brought back into the land of Israel, and where the Gentiles will be converted, abandoning their former ways (14,5-7). Tobit's eschatological vision shares many of these features with other important eschatological passages (e.g., Jer 3,17; Isa 2,2-4; *Pss. Sol.* 17,28-35), and some scholars have noted that the phrase κληρονομήσει γῆν in Tob 4,12 is a direct echo of Isa 60,21²², an eschatological promise that God's people will "inherit the land forever" (αἰῶνος κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν). Given the eschatological vision that concludes the book of Tobit, it is possible that the future tense reference to inherit the land in 4,12 is a foreshadowing of this eschatological vision. "Will inherit the land" in 4,12 is tied to Abraham's offspring, and in 14,7 Tobit refers to the reconstituted Israel as "the land of Abraham". God's people, the offspring of the patriarchs, are still in line to inherit a reconstituted Israel where Jews and Gentiles come together in unified worship of Israel's God²³.

mentioned in the verse; (2) the exilic context of the speaker (Tobit); and (3) the post-exilic context of the audience of the text. Although the audience is in the diaspora, the temple had been rebuilt and many of the exiles had returned to Jerusalem. The restoration of Jerusalem had begun, but the audience of the text was still awaiting the full ingathering of the exiles into the land of promise. It is not entirely clear from the context whether κληρονομήσει promises: (a) the inheritance to the direct offspring of the patriarchs; (b) an inheritance that was still being awaited by the characters of the story but was fulfilled for the author and readers by the restoration of Jerusalem; or (c) a still unrealized future inheritance for the diasporic audience of the book. The least likely option is (a), as it is hard to imagine the writer using a future tense verb for something that was in the past for both himself and the characters of his story. The potential relationship between Tob 4,12 and chs. 13-14 makes (c) the most likely option.

²² See FITZMYER, *Tobit*, 174, and MOORE, *Tobit*, 169.

²³ Tying "will inherit the land" in 4,12 to chapters 13-14 is potentially called into question if it can be demonstrated that chapters 13-14 are not original to the composition. Several proposals have argued in favor of redacted layers and scribal innovation in the composition. See, for example, F. ZIMMERMAN, *The Book of Tobit. An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York 1958) 21, who argues that chapters 13 and 14 are independent of one another, and both are later additions to the text. P. DESELAERS, *Das Buch Tobit. Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie* (OBO 43; Göttingen 1982) and M. RABENAU, *Studien zum Buch Tobit* (BZAW 220; Berlin 1994) both argue that Tobit betrays four layers of editorial activity detectable throughout the text,

This nationalistic inheritance is tied to the inheritance of Tobias and Sarah's marriage as the two stories parallel one another. In both inheritances, the providence of God plays a central role: it is God who determined the marriage of Tobias and Sarah (7,10-14), and it is God who will gather his chosen people from the nations in which they are scattered (13,5). The success or failure of both the nation and the marriage are conditional; they depend on obedience to the law of Moses. The vision for a restored Israel is a nationalist one, but the inclusion of the promises made to Abraham's offspring focus on the role of Abraham's offspring as a light to the nations (13,11), an aspect of the Abrahamic promises that finds its development in the prophetic eschatological tradition of which the book of Tobit is a part.

II. FAMILY AND FAITH IN THE JEWISH DIASPORA

The exile forced many Jews to navigate the circumstances of displacement and formulate a new beginning. The loss of land signified the loss of security and prosperity and created a crisis of identity, which likely led many Jews to reconsider and reinterpret their elect status as God's distinct people. Furthermore, Jews in the diaspora were brought into contact with non-Jews with increased frequency, leading to concerns regarding cultural purity²⁴. For their relationship with God to survive the calamity of exile, diaspora Jews needed to understand how God's blessings

though they disagree on which passages belong to which layer and the manner in which these layers were developed. J.J. COLLINS, "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit", *The Book of Tobit. Text, Tradition, Theology* (eds. G. XERAVITS – J. ZSENGELLÉR) (JSJSup 98; Leiden 2005) 23-40, here 25, argues that the core story of Tobit is found in chapters 2–12, and that chapters 1 and 13–14 might have been added later to place the story in the broader context of Israel's history. Still, Collins recognizes that parts of chapters 1 and 14 were likely original, and that parts of 2–12 might have also been added by later editors. N.S.S. JACOBS, "Scribal Innovation and the Book of Tobit: A Long Overdue Discussion", *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls*. John Collins at Seventy (eds. J. BADEN – H. NAJMAN – E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR) (JSJSup 175; Leiden 2017) 579-610, confirms Collins' view about chapters 2–12 being distinctive from 1 and 13–14, but also argues that 2–12 underwent significant scribal innovation. Several evaluations have engaged with concerns regarding the integrity of the text and demonstrated its unity. See, for example, FITZMYER, *Tobit*, 45. The issue is not settled. However, the arguments in this study lend credence to the unity of certain aspects of the composition, by tying the desire for tribal purity to the hope of the future restoration of tribal land allotments, and by tying the phrase "inherit the earth" in 4,12 to the expectation of a reconstituted Israel in 14,5-7. This study is not focused on issues regarding the composition's unity, but the debate should consider issues of land, exile, diaspora, and eschatology.

²⁴ See D.A. DESILVA, *Introducing the Apocrypha. Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids, MI 2018) 64, who argues that Tobit's author was "a pious Jew concerned

continued even after this disaster was brought upon the nation by their own disobedience. This necessitated the emergence of creative theological strategies.

Rainer Albertz argues that the loss of central political authority in the exile led to “the revival of decentralized forms of organization along kinship lines”²⁵. This means that the family became the main social entity and an acute focus on tribal organization was revived²⁶. The family became the vehicle of personal piety and the place where Jews maintained a hope in God. Exilic families were forced to develop new traditions and instructions so that God’s concern for his people could be emphasized apart from land and cult. Children continued to be born, work continued to be undertaken, and Jews were able to find their own private happiness, so for exilic Jews “God’s action in deliverance and blessing continued even after the national disaster”²⁷. The religion of the Jews developed from one of national liberation to one where God’s intervention was experienced in relief from lesser forms of family distress. Even as temple worship was re-established in Judea in the Hellenistic era, diaspora Jews continued to rely on family worship, and they began to view national redemption as an eschatological hope²⁸. The need to maintain their cultural identity was compounded by their proximity to Gentiles, as “ethnic belonging was no longer something that could be taken for granted”²⁹. The plurality of Jewish groups, with various newly established and developing customs, meant that *intra muros* conflicts and

with keeping the covenant and maintaining Jewish identity and solidarity within a Gentile-dominant culture”.

²⁵ R. ALBERTZ, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, Vol. 2. From the Exile to the Maccabees* (Louisville, KY 1994) 375. For a focused presentation on family religion in ancient Israel, see *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (eds. J. BODEL – S.M. OLYAN) (Malden, MA 2008), particularly chapters 6–8.

²⁶ The difference between tribal distinction and nationalist organization is apparent when contrasting the emphases found in various antecedent texts. For example, Numbers and Judges exemplify tribal social boundaries, while in 1 and 2 Samuel tribal distinctions fade and give way to the promotion of the monarchy and a national agenda and identity. This is illustrated by the use of the phrase כל־יִשְׂרָאֵל (“all Israel”), which occurs in Judges just twice, in 8,27 and 20,34, whereas it is used in the books of Samuel thirty-three times. L.E. STAGER, “Forging and Identity: The Emergence of Ancient Israel”, *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (ed. M.D. COOGAN) (New York 1998) 90–131, here 149–151, notes that the Israelite “tribe” can be understood as kinship based on common descent. The precise boundaries and constitution of the Israelite “tribe” can be difficult to determine. As Stager describes, kinship is implied, but it is not sufficient to assume that the tribes were solely kin-based. Tribes were socio-political groups focused on allegiance and shared identity.

²⁷ ALBERTZ, *History*, 401.

²⁸ ALBERTZ, *History*, 403, 564.

²⁹ ALBERTZ, *History*, 449.

debates took on new social and religious dimensions. It became possible for Jewish groups to deny membership of the community to their fellow Jews in order to claim that their own group was the “true Israel” ³⁰.

In Tobit, a new beginning for Tobias and Sarah closely parallels and mirrors a new beginning for all Israel, and inheritance concepts signify the establishment of these new beginnings. Sarah’s need for an heir to her father’s estate, as a source of security for the future of her family, parallels Israel’s ongoing need of salvation. The salvation of Tobit’s family and Israel’s return from exile are affirmed together in Tobit’s deathbed speech (14,3-11). It is in the narrative structure of these parallel stories and the dynamics of Jewish life in the diaspora that we can best explain Tobit’s moderate deviations from the concepts of inheritance and family dynamics found in the Pentateuch.

The author of Tobit relies on allusions to various Pentateuchal stories, some more explicit than others, but he recontextualizes these stories to fit his diasporic circumstances. These allusions include an appeal to the patriarchs and potentially to legislation related to endogamy and familial and tribal purity involving levirate marriage and the circumstances of the daughters of Zelophehad. These allusions ground the diaspora community in long-standing aspects of Jewish cultural identity, but the writer adapts these allusions based on an exilic-era interpretation of these Pentateuchal ideas. For example, prior to the introduction of a monarch, Israel emphasized tribal distinctions in order to preserve the boundaries of land allotments given to individual tribes (Num 34,13-29). David A. deSilva insightfully argues that this is important to Tobit’s writer: the interweaving of a concern for endogamy with “the historic concern that property (particularly land) remain with the collective inheritance of each tribe” ³¹. For the diaspora community after the exile, the loss of both the land and the monarchy opened the door for a refashioning of cultural purity and identity along both familial and tribal lines, while all of the inheritances granted by God might also be re-envisioned as an extension of Torah’s legislative

³⁰ Especially helpful on the dynamics of *intra muros* debates within Judaism in the diaspora, as well as the dynamics of the relationships between Jews and their Gentile neighbors, is J.M.G. BARCLAY, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*. From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE) (Berkeley, CA 1996) especially 82-124 and 399-441.

³¹ DESILVA, *Introducing*, 73. See also A.J. LEVINE, “Diaspora as Metaphor: Bodies and Boundaries in the Book of Tobit”, *Diaspora Jews and Judaism*. Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel (eds. J.A. OVERMAN – R.S. MACLENNAN) (SFSHJ 41; Atlanta, GA 1992) 105-118, here 108-109, who argues that the very purpose of endogamy in the narrative is the anticipation of the ingathering of the exiles. The land does not define the community; endogamy leads to self-definition, and obtaining the land is the result.

customs even if they are not precisely applied ³². For Tobit, God is still a father to his people (13,3-4), and inheritance can still be regarded as an aspect of this relationship.

Although Tobit 13–14 is often discussed for its contribution to Tobit’s eschatological outlook, scholars often fail to appreciate the role of Tob 4,12 in anticipating a reconstituted vision for the land. The phrase “inherit the land/earth” is rare in Jewish and early Christian texts, and in almost every case it denotes a new and recalibrated eschatological vision of how an inherited land might be entered into and experienced. A slightly different construction of the phrase (κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν) is found in three places (*I En.* 5,5-9; Isa 61,7; Matt 5,5), and in each of these instances the inheritance is a future promise for those who have only a tentative grasp on the land and so are dependent on God for some form of vindication. In each passage, to inherit the land/earth is to be included among the community and to be found within the identity of those connected to God. To be left out from the inheritance is to be excluded from identifying with God’s people and their anticipated salvation and idealized future ³³.

Despite the fact that cultural purity is a considerable concern in the text, Tobit’s diaspora context must deal with the dynamics of the community’s ongoing proximity to Gentiles. The land inheritance is remembered squarely in its Pentateuchal context (4,12), but their non-Jewish neighbors are prophesied to have a place as those who submit to the God of the Jews and worship him (14,5-7) ³⁴. Many diaspora Jews were forced

³² See J. HICKS-KEETON, “Already/Not Yet: Eschatological Tension in the Book of Tobit”, *JBL* 132 (2013) 97-117, here 115, who points out the consistent theme of familial language used of fellow tribesman throughout the text, including Tobias and Sarah being referred to as brother and sister (7,9,12; 8,7). Hicks-Keeton states: “this literary feature binds the Israelite characters as family and further highlights endogamy as a means of group identity preservation in a foreign land”.

³³ There is precedent in the Second Temple period for an expansion of the eschatological inheritance from the land of Israel to the earth more broadly. Psalm 36 in the LXX (Psalm 37 in MT) features some form of the phrase κληρονομήσουσι γῆν (inherit the land) five times (36,9.11.22.29.34). In the psalm, it is apparent that the land of Israel is in view. However, in the *Psalms Pesher*, a commentary found among the Qumran Scrolls, this psalm is interpreted eschatologically. Rather than Israel alone, the pesher concludes that the righteous will inherit “the whole earth”. For a critical edition of the *Psalms Pesher* see *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, vol. 6B: *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH) (Tübingen 2002) 6-33. The comments on inheritance in the pesher primarily concern Ps 37,22.34.

³⁴ Gentile inclusion in repatriation contexts is a feature of exilic and post-exilic texts. See, for example, Jer 3,17; Isa 2,2-4; *Pss. Sol.* 17,28-35. It is unclear in Tob 14,5-7 if the converted nations remain in their own lands and worship the Jewish God from those locations, or if some of them have a share in the reconstituted Israel. There are repatriation texts of the Second Temple period that envision Gentiles joining the repatriated Jews in the land.

to re-envision the land promise and the ethnic and cultural boundaries of inclusion based on their evolving relationship to non-Jews. This vision is an understandable reversal of power dynamics; Jews in the diaspora are threatened with forces that encourage assimilation into the dominant Gentile culture, but texts such as Tobit envision a time when the Gentiles will recognize the superiority of the Jewish God and Jewish laws and customs, and will “abandon their idols, which deceitfully have led them into their error” (14,6). Such an eschatological hope was crucial in preserving the Jewish people in the midst of non-Jewish nations. This aligns with the author’s understanding that life in the diaspora is a temporary state of affairs, and that maintaining the life of a Jew in the diaspora is not done in vain but will be rewarded with an eventual return to the land of promise, the ideal inheritance.

KU Leuven – Research Unit in Biblical Studies
Sint-Michielsstraat 4, Box 3101
3000 Leuven, Belgium

Daniel DALEY

SUMMARY

The book of Tobit is concerned with Jewish identity, and it ties many of its identity markers to the Torah. However, there has been some debate regarding which aspects of Torah were the greatest influence upon Tobit’s author for the purpose of identity construction. This paper analyzes Tobit’s use of “inheritance” terms, and argues that they are the key to understanding the issues of identity and inclusion in the text. The author of Tobit understood the importance of Torah’s presentation of theological inheritance, but he adopted and adapted inheritance terms to fit the diaspora context of the book’s audience.

POLITICAL FOLLY AND ROYAL WISDOM IN ECCL 5,7-8

I. INTRODUCTION

Qohelet's critique of royal leadership in Eccl 5,7-8 (8-9) constitutes one of the book's most difficult texts ¹. Gordis deems it "an insuperable crux", while Seow fears it is "hopelessly corrupt", and Ginsburg laments its "almost innumerable" interpretations ². Recent scholarship has moved toward understanding both verses as a criticism of a corrupt government in which the king is complicit in the graft of lower officials because he too profits from exploiting the land and its farmers ³. In what follows, I argue for a fresh understanding of the verses, based on discourse analysis, that favors an older, principally Continental view. In this proposed reading v. 8 offsets v. 7, with the king viewed positively as a mitigation to rampant political corruption when he is committed to order, stability, and productivity. Rather than serving as another pronouncement of Qohelet's negative view of leadership, Eccl 5,7-8 affirms the proper use of royal power when the king exercises his office legitimately ⁴. While Qohelet is keen to address themes of poverty and oppression, he offsets these concerns somewhat by concluding that hierarchical levels of oversight, culminating in the king, offer some explanation (5,7) and ideally some restraint (5,8) for corruption, however infrequent and imperfect these countermeasures may be. This reading carries implications for Qohelet's views concerning the validity of royal authority. I begin with a brief outline of the unit's

¹ In this essay I use Hebrew versification for the text. The Hebrew text versifies the preceding unit as 4,17 – 5,6, with English versions versifying the same unit as 5,1-7. The unit of study is thus versified 5,7-8 in the Hebrew text and 5,8-9 in the English versions.

² R. GORDIS, *Koheleth, the Man and His World. A Study of Ecclesiastes* (New York 1968) 250; C.-L. SEOW, *Ecclesiastes* (AB; New York 1997) 204; C.D. GINSBURG, *The Song of Songs and Koheleth* (reprint ed.; New York 1970) 346.

³ T. LONGMAN III, *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 158-159; W.P. BROWN, *Ecclesiastes* (Interpretation; Louisville, KY 2000) 58-59; P. ENNS, *Ecclesiastes* (THOTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2011) 70; A. SCHOORS, *Ecclesiastes* (HCOT; Leuven 2013) 414-415; R.P. BELCHER, *Ecclesiastes* (Mentor Commentary; Ross-shire, UK 2017) 205-206; K.M. HEIM, *Ecclesiastes* (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries; Downers Grove, IL 2019) 95; G. ATHAS, *Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs* (Story of God Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI 2020) 128-129.

⁴ Recent commentators are keen to read Ecclesiastes as a political treatise written in opposition to the authoritarian abuses of the Ptolemaic dynasty; see, e.g., ATHAS, *Ecclesiastes*, 29-34; HEIM, *Ecclesiastes*, 4-8; SCHOORS, *Ecclesiastes*, 7-9. For arguments in favor of a Persian-period dating, see SEOW, *Ecclesiastes*, 21-36.

parameters and proposed text and translation. I follow this with a more extensive analysis of the factors leading to these conclusions.

II. DISCOURSE PARAMETERS

Several factors signal a new unit in Eccl 5,7-8: the change of topic, the shift in discourse features, and the reactivation of keywords. The asyndetic conditional particle **אם** marks the inception of the section (cf. 6,3). The complement **עֲשֵׂה** (“oppression”) is topic-fronted in place of the customary sequence of conditional particle immediately followed by the verb, signaling a discourse shift to reactivate earlier themes of poverty, oppression, and justice ⁵. Interpreters divide over how 5,7-8 relates to the preceding, if at all. While Qohelet continues addressing the reader directly as in 4,17 – 5,6, the themes appear to be distinct ⁶. Lauha argues that vv. 7-8 are completely independent with no connection thematically to what comes before or after, while Loader essentially subsumes them to the preceding as a continuation of Qohelet’s admonitions on proper speech before God ⁷. Delitzsch sees a connection between fearing God (v. 7) and fearing the king (v. 8) (cf. Prov 24,21) ⁸. Others propose a loose connection with the later units rather than earlier ones, ⁹ since, as Bartholomew notes, the theme of oppression leads naturally to the theme of pursuing wealth, often a cause of oppression ¹⁰.

Following the work of Fredericks, Seow posits a chiasm of themes that binds together 5,7 – 6,9 as follows ¹¹:

- A People Who Cannot Be Satisfied (5,8-12)
- B People Who Cannot Enjoy (5,13-17)
- C What Is Good (5,18-19)
- D Enjoy the Moment (5,20)
- C’ What Is Bad (6,1-2)
- B’ People Who Cannot Enjoy (6,3-6)
- A’ People Who Cannot Be Satisfied (6,7-9)

⁵ R.D. HOLMSTEDT – J.A. COOK – P.S. MARSHALL, *Qoheleth. A Handbook on the Hebrew Text* (Waco, TX 2017) 170.

⁶ Qohelet initiates direct address to the reader in 4,17 and ends it in 5,7. He will resume direct address in 7,9-22.

⁷ A. LAUHA, *Kohelet* (BKAT; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 103; J.A. LOADER, *Ecclesiastes* (trans. J. VRIEND) (Grand Rapids, MI 1986) 57-60.

⁸ F. DELITZSCH, *Commentary on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes* (trans. M.G. EASTON) (Edinburgh 1891) 291.

⁹ R. MURPHY, *Ecclesiastes* (WBC; Dallas, TX 1992) 51; M.V. FOX, *A Time to Tear Down and a Time to Build Up. A Rereading of Ecclesiastes* (Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 233.

¹⁰ C. BARTHOLOMEW, *Ecclesiastes* (BCOTWP; Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 216.

¹¹ See D.C. FREDERICKS, “Chiasm and Parallel Structure in Qoheleth 5:9 – 6:9”, *JBL* 108 (1989) 17-35; SEOW, *Ecclesiastes*, 216-217.

Recently Belcher has critiqued Seow's chiasm, however, because, unlike Fredericks, Seow includes 5,7-9 in the chiasm while separating 5,20 from 5,18-19¹². Bartholomew, on the other hand, contends that both chiasms are suspect: Fredericks's because he forces thematic congruence between 5,18-20 and 6,1-2, and Seow's because he isolates v. 20 from the rest of the commendation of joy¹³. My own structural analysis also differs from Seow's proposal in that 5,18-20 is likely to be kept together as a concluding unit (evident by the inferential conjunction כִּי heading v. 20) and in that the larger section that begins in 3,1 ends not at 6,9 but at 7,24.

Schwiehorst-Schönberger argues that 5,7-8 relates to the preceding by forming a frame with 4,13-16 around the critique of foolish worship practices in 4,16 – 5,6¹⁴. This is evident in an organizing principle that alternates lexically and thematically from the king to God and back: "king" (מֶלֶךְ) (4,13-16) — "God" (אֱלֹהִים) (4,17 – 5,6) — "king" (מֶלֶךְ) (5,7-8)¹⁵. The initial unit (5,7-8) links backward to the themes of chapter 4 through the catchwords "oppression" (עֲשָׂק) (5,7; 4,1[3×]), "king" (מֶלֶךְ) (5,8; 4,13.14), and "poor" (רֵשׁ) (5,7; 4,14), and obliquely to the themes of human effort and folly with "matter" (חֶפֶץ) (5,7 [cf. vv. 1.3]), and "keep" (שָׁמַר) (5,8 [cf. v. 1]). A forward connection is made through the catchword "serve/cultivate" (עָבַד) (5,8.13). Other literary connections to preceding units are more subtle but include correspondences between "heaven" (שָׁמַיִם) (4,17) and the "high (official)" (גִּבְהָה) (5,7), the "land" (אֶרֶץ) as the realm of human activity (5,1.8), and the frequent perversion of "justice and righteousness" (מִשְׁפָּט וְצֶדֶק) somehow encompassed in God's sovereign, mysterious ordering of human affairs (3,16-17; 4,1; 5,7). While Qohelet reintroduces themes of poverty and oppression from earlier in the book, he offsets them by concluding that hierarchical levels of oversight, culminating in the king, offer some explanation (5,7) and ideally some restraint (5,8) for corruption, albeit infrequent and imperfect¹⁶. The reader is not to be shocked at injustice because corruption is endemic to all levels of political leadership (5,7), although this disheartening reality may be mitigated by a king devoted to a well-ordered and productive society (5,8).

¹² BELCHER, *Ecclesiastes*, 204 n. 143.

¹³ BARTHOLOMEW, *Ecclesiastes*, 216 n. 14.

¹⁴ L. SCHWIEHORST-SCHÖNBERGER, *Kohelet* (HThKAT; Freiburg 2004) 320.

¹⁵ SCHWIEHORST-SCHÖNBERGER (*Kohelet*, 320) likens this to the shift in Proverbs from "YHWH" in 15,33 – 16,9 to "king" in 16,10-15.

¹⁶ See M. STUART, *A Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (New York 1851) 183.

III. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The following text and translation of Eccl 5,7-8 precedes a detailed analysis of the passage supporting the conclusions offered.

<i>Eccl 5,7-8</i>		
7	אם־עשק רש וגזל משפט וצדק תראה במדינה אלתתמה על־החפץ כי גבה מעל גבה שמר וגבהים עליהם	If you observe the oppression of the poor and the robbery of justice and righteousness ¹⁷ in the district, do not be shocked at the matter, for one official watches out ¹⁸ for another official, and there are officials over them.
8	ויתרון ארץ בכל הוא מלך לשדה נעבד	Yet a king over all ¹⁹ who ²⁰ is devoted to cultivated fields is an advantage to a country.

¹⁷ Syriac Peshitta conflates the two substantives of MT (משפט וצדק) into one term *wdyn* ("justice"), perhaps out of contextual considerations. The other versions attest the MT reading, and I follow it here.

¹⁸ The original reading in LXX, supported by Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Origen, and numerous other mss (adopted by RAHLFS and GENTRY), is φυλάξαι (aor. inf. act.), "to guard", "to watch", which suggests a Hebrew *Vorlage* read as שמר ("to watch") in place of the MT's act. part. שמר ("is watching"). Codices Alexandrinus, Ephraemi, and a number of other mss read the present tense φυλάσσει ("watches"), which may be construed as arising from the MT. Syr, Vg, and Tg are inconclusive. The external evidence for emendation is not strong enough to warrant departure from the MT.

¹⁹ E. RENAN (*L'Ecclésiaste* [Paris 1882] 152) concludes that the Hebrew is likely mistaken. LXX RAHLFS follows Venetus against his other Greek witnesses to align with MT in ἐν παντί ("in all") (= בכל) (see GOLDMAN, *BHQ*, 83*). LXX GENTRY chooses ἐπὶ παντί ("over all"), the reading preferred by GOLDMAN (*BHQ*, 83*) as original to LXX and supported by σ' and Tg (על כולא). Vg appears to follow the LXX (*insuper universae*), but Jerome in his commentary follows the MT, as do a nucleus of other Greek mss and Syr (see LXX GENTRY, 177). GOLDMAN emends to על־כל ("above all") in favor of the LXX reading. He supports the change by noting that the final word, Niphal *qatal* of עבד refers always in the OT to the cultivation of land (Deut 21,4; Ezek 36,9.34) and that the phrase על־כל means "above all" in several OT passages (Pss 95,3; 96,4; 97,9). He thus attains the following sense: "And the benefit of the land, above all, is a king to a cultivated ground" (*BHQ*, 83*). The rationale for the emendation is that it provides "a more contrasted expression between the powers of a commercial culture, which produces administration and all kinds of social strata with their iniquities (v. 7), and what is best 'above all' for a land, a society living from agriculture and having a king at its head" (*BHQ*, 83*). GOLDMAN appears here, however, to foist a sociological lens upon a text-critical determination. While the original LXX reading is likely the one adopted by GENTRY and GOLDMAN, the MT is preferred in the absence of Hebrew witnesses for emendation and a more plausible rationale for the proposed rise of the variant בכל from על־כל. The emendation, in any event, becomes unnecessary when one realizes that the phrase בכל carries the sense "over/above all" in other texts (2 Chr 29,12; Ps 103,19).

²⁰ While MT *kethib* reads the 3fs pronoun היא, the *qere*, along with LXX, σ', θ', and Syr, support reading the 3ms הוא. I follow GOLDMAN (*BHQ*, 83*) in emending the MT to הוא ("he, it"), which refers then to either יתרון ("advantage" [masc.]) or מלך ("king") rather than to ארץ ("land" [fem.]).

IV. EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS

In 5,7-8 Qohelet re-activates the theme of oppression introduced in 4,1 (cf. 3,16; 4,14). In the following, I analyze the significant exegetical and discourse features of the passage.

1. Verse 7

The opening particle **אם** (“if”) is often classified by grammarians as introducing the protasis of a real conditional with its corresponding details, rather than of an unreal conditional ²¹. The taxonomy of conditionals in the OT first proposed by H. Ferguson includes four classes, moving from real and actual to impossible or contrary to reality ²². More recently W.E. Bivin has cast doubt on the adequacy of this framework, given that a logical-philosophical approach to linguistics falls short of marking clear-cut boundaries amongst various types of conditionals, such as, for example, speech-act conditionals and counterfactuals ²³. He proposes, building on the work of Sweetser and others, a cognitive-functional approach to conditionals in the Hebrew Bible that recognizes three categories: (1) Content conditionals: conditionals that present a possible state of affairs in the world and are predictive and characteristically causative (e.g., “If it rains tomorrow, the game will be canceled”); (2) Generic or epistemic conditionals: conditioned generic statements that ascribe general properties to all members of a class and are also predictive (e.g., “If you heat water to 100 degrees [C], it boils”); and (3) Speech-act conditionals: conditioned fulfillment of an expected state of affairs in the protasis that triggers a speech-act in the apodosis, such as a directive, question, oath, vow, promise, or threat (e.g., “If you’re hungry, there’s food in the refrigerator” [i.e., “I am granting

²¹ R.J. WILLIAMS, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax* (rev. J.C. BECKMAN) (Toronto ³2007) 160, §453; C.H.J. VAN DER MERWE – J.A. NAUDÉ – J.H. KROEZE, *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield 2002) 295, §40.5.1. The particles **אם** and **כי** are used somewhat interchangeably, although **כי** introduces general conditions while **אם** specifies the details of these general conditions (300, §40.9.I.1). HOLMSTEDT – COOK – MARSHALL (*Qoheleth*, 170) classify the *yiqtol* here as *irrealis* but that designation is tangential to the class of the conditional.

²² (1) Class 1 assumes the condition to be real and actual; (2) Class 2 assumes the condition to be probable; (3) Class 3 is indefinite with no assumption of probability; and (4) Class 4 assumes the condition to be impossible and contrary to reality. See H. FERGUSON, “An Examination of the Use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew”, *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 2 (1882) 59.

²³ W.E. BIVIN, “Domain-Based Conditionality in Biblical Hebrew”, *Bib* 100 (2019) 187-206; IDEM, “The Particle **אם** and Conditionality in Biblical Hebrew Revisited: A Cognitive Linguistic Account” (PhD diss., University of Stellenbosch, 2017).

you permission to access the food”])²⁴. Content conditionals comprise about 13% of conditionals in the OT (e.g., Gen 32,8; Exod 18,23), with generic conditionals representing only 5% (e.g., Ps 41,7; Prov 9,12)²⁵.

Speech-act conditionals comprise the majority of conditionals in the OT (82%) and consist of five sub-categories: (1) directives; (2) oaths, vows, and curses; (3) promises and threats; (4) petitions; and (5) questions²⁶. The conditional in 5,7 is a speech-act directive. These types of conditionals are most common in casuistic law and procedural texts, and where not occurring in these types of discourse, they are found most often in direct speech²⁷. Apart from the foregoing occurrences are sixteen uses, primarily in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, that Bivin characterizes as didactic discourse. In these texts the narrator-sage instructs his readers about a future eventuality that will trigger the directive carried in the speech-act of the apodosis. Applying these conclusions to the present conditional clause, Qohelet instructs his readers that they should expect to observe the oppression of the poor and the perversion of justice (this reality is anticipated), and that when they do so, this triggers the directive that they must not be alarmed by it.

The term עֶשֶׂק means “oppression”, “brutality”, or “extortion”²⁸. The nominal form occurs twice in Ecclesiastes (5,7; 7,7) and around 15 times in the OT, with the verbal form, “to oppress”, “to defraud”, or “to extort”, occurring three times in Ecclesiastes (4,1) and around 40 times in the OT. The substantive occurs most frequently in the major prophets, where the ethical corruption of Israel is condemned due to the rampant mistreatment of the needy and the marginalized (Isa 30,12; 54,14; 59,13; Jer 6,6; 22,17; Ezek 18,18; 22,7.12.29). Only here in the OT is the noun collocated with רֵשַׁע, “to be poor”, “to be in want”, or “to be a pauper”²⁹, with the latter occurring around 25 times in the OT, mostly in Proverbs. Although HALOT characterizes this term as “the most neutral designation of the

²⁴ See BIVIN, “Domain-Based Conditionality in Biblical Hebrew”, 190-192; see also E. SWEETSER, *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure* (Cambridge 1991); B. DANCYGIER – E. SWEETSER, *Mental Spaces in Grammar. Conditional Constructions* (Cambridge 2005); P. WERTH, “Conditionality as Cognitive Distance”, in *On Conditionals Again* (eds. R. DIRVEN – A. ATHANASIADOU) (Amsterdam 1997) 243-271.

²⁵ BIVIN, “The Particle ׀ and Conditionality”, 76, 133.

²⁶ BIVIN, “The Particle ׀ and Conditionality”, 144.

²⁷ BIVIN, “The Particle ׀ and Conditionality”, 147, 150.

²⁸ L. KOEHLER – W. BAUMGARTNER, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (trans. M.E.J. RICHARDSON) (2 vols.; Leiden 2001) 897; D.J.A. CLINES (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (8 vols.; Sheffield 1993-2011) 6.620-621.

²⁹ F. BROWN – S. DRIVER – C. BRIGGS, *The Brown — Driver — Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (reprint of 1906 ed.; Peabody, MA 2000) 930; HALOT, 1209; DCH, 7.455.

poor (man) in his social and economic situation”³⁰, the term appears regularly in contexts emphasizing the low esteem many have toward the poor (Prov 14,20; 17,5; 19,7) and the affliction that impoverished people frequently experience (Prov 13,8). Elsewhere in the OT, David uses the term “poor” to describe himself in highlighting his lack of reputation: he is a “nobody” (1 Sam 18,23). Thus the poor are not to be scorned merely for their poverty. Their oppression is a great evil and troubling problem to be navigated in a fallen world.

Here Qohelet is concerned not only with the oppression of the poor but with its corollary, the miscarriage of justice. The term גָּזַל, “robbery”, occurs in this form only here and in Ezek 18,18, although the related term גָּזַל, “robbery, plunder” occurs several times elsewhere (Lev 5,23; Ps 62,11; Isa 61,8; Ezek 22,29)³¹. The “robbery” described here *The Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* defines as the “action whereby humans take property unlawfully from a person or place, usually by force or threat of force”³². The term contrasts thus with גָּנַב, which emphasizes stealth, with גָּזַל emphasizing violence or force³³. The term applies rarely to the robbery of an abstract concept, but a parallel passage may be found in Isa 10,2 using the verbal form: “Ah, you who make iniquitous decrees, who write oppressive statutes, to turn aside the needy from justice and to rob the poor of my people of their right” (Isa 10,1-2a)³⁴. Thus Delitzsch classifies the term here as the “wicked, shameless depriving of a just claim”³⁵. The verbs גָּזַל and עָשָׂק occur often together in the OT as a conventional pairing that describes socio-economic exploitation and extortion (Lev 5,21.23; 19,13; Deut 28,29; Jer 21,12; 22,3; Ezek 18,18; 22,29; Mic 2,2; Ps 62,11).

The word-pair of מִשְׁפָּט (“legal decision”, “legal claim”, “dispute”, or “justice”) and צְדָקָה (“righteousness”, “uprightness”, or “right conduct”) recalls their earlier appearance in 3,16-17. The terms derive from the semantic field of jurisprudence and construe both the legal enactment of what is right (מִשְׁפָּט) and the ethical practice of what is right (צְדָקָה). They occur often as a word-pair or hendiadys connoting impartial judgment (2 Sam 8,15; 1 Kgs 10,9; Job 37,23; Pss 33,5; 89,14; Prov 2,9;

³⁰ HALOT, 1290.

³¹ HALOT, 186; DCH, 2.340.

³² *The Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* (ed. R. DE BLOIS) s.v. “גָּזַל”, available online at <https://semanticdictionary.org/semdic.php?databaseType=SDBH>, accessed 20 May 2021.

³³ W. DOMERIS, “גָּזַל”, NIDOTTE, 1.844.

³⁴ Unless otherwise noted, all scriptural citations are from the NEW REVISED STANDARD VERSION (New York 1989).

³⁵ DELITZSCH, *Ecclesiastes*, 292.

12,5; Isa 9,6; Jer 4,2; Zech 7,9). Discussion surrounds whether Qohelet has in mind the more abstract legal rights of citizens or the more tangible rendering of justice in the courts of law. Fox argues for the former, seeing here a hendiadys connoting “just due” or legal rights that people possess inherently and may be deprived of³⁶. Rozenberg likewise takes the terms as hendiadys denoting a general expression for legal justice³⁷. Stuart takes the pair as encompassing too the actual trial of the poor where unethical decisions rob them of their goods³⁸. It seems best to view the primary purview as the legal rights or claims of the poor for an equitable hearing (specifically “justice” is robbed), which undoubtedly works out concretely in the denial of justice in the courts through the forceable seizure of property or persons. One obvious area in which the courts were prone to the miscarriage of justice lay in the tendency of judges to be corrupted by bribes and preferentialism³⁹. The Law commanded Israel to reflect YHWH’s character as the one “who is not partial and takes no bribe” (Deut 10,17). Isaiah condemned the leaders of his day as generally corrupt: “everyone loves bribes and runs after gifts” (Isa 1,23). A criterion for selecting judges included aversion to dishonest gain, and the prophets often confront judges for their venality (Exod 18,21; Deut 16,19; Isa 5,23; Mic 7,3).

Qohelet’s readers will observe (ראה) this injustice in the “province”. The term מדינה (“province”, “district”, “satrapy”) is considered late given its frequency in the exilic and post-exilic books (Esther [39×]; Ezra-Nehemiah [4×]; Daniel [2×])⁴⁰. The term appears also, however, in the historical books (1 Kgs 20,14.15.17.19; cf. Lxx 2 Kgs 18,24) and in the exilic prophets (Ezek 19,8; Lam 1,1) to denote the organization of the kingdom into districts with governors⁴¹. Qohelet likely uses the term here in the same sense as in 2,8 to denote a district or province, such as those organized by Solomon (1 Kings 4) and Ahab (1 Kings 20), and which

³⁶ FOX, *A Time to Tear Down*, 233-234.

³⁷ M. ROZENBERG, “The Stem *špt*: An Investigation of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Sources” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1963) 150-151.

³⁸ M. STUART, *Ecclesiastes*, 183.

³⁹ See M.R. WILSON, “Bribery”, *DDL*, 1.217-219.

⁴⁰ HALOT, 549; DCH, 5.147. On the late dating, see G. BARTON, *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (ICC; Edinburgh 1908) 130-131.

⁴¹ J.L. KUGEL (“Qohelet and Money”, *CBQ* 51 [1989] 32-49, here 37-38) argues that the term relates instead to דין (“to judge”) and מדרן (“legal dispute”), here meaning “place of judgment”. SEOW (*Ecclesiastes*, 202) appears to give credence to this view by positing a wordplay here with מדינה connoting both “province” and “place of jurisdiction”. M. DAHOOD (“Phoenician Background of Qoheleth”, *Bib* 47 [1966] 267-278) proposes, upon Phoenician evidence, the meaning “governor” or “prefect”, while M. FRAENKEL suggests additional glosses of “town”, “district”, or “state”.

also presumably encompassed judicial circuits. He has thus shifted his observations from the temple (5,1) to the surrounding environs of Judea ⁴².

Observers of injustice are not to be shocked by the matter. The term **תמה** signifies “to be astonished”, “be amazed”, or “be horrified” ⁴³. The term is relatively uncommon in the OT, with nine occurrences mostly in the prophets and wisdom (Gen 43,33; Job 26,11; Ps 48,5; Eccl 5,7; Isa 13,8; 29,9; Jer 4,9; Hab 1,5). The meaning of the word as used here is often taken to be late, approaching the Talmudic meaning of “to look with astonishment” ⁴⁴. Several factors tell against this, however. First, the term approximates the latter meaning even in earlier texts such as Gen 43,33; Isa 13,8; and Jer 4,9 ⁴⁵. Second, the occurrences of the term in the OT are too few to determine diachronic change. Third, the translation “look with astonishment” is probably not correct in this verse given that the notion of perception is carried in the verb **ראה** (cf. Ps 48,5; Hab 1,5) ⁴⁶. U. Berges notes that this is most often the case: four of the nine occurrences of the verb relate explicitly to the verb **ראה** and two suggest visual perception of some kind ⁴⁷. The term denotes principally, then, *not* to gaze with astonishment so much as the human reaction to an experience, visual or otherwise. The verb stresses either the emotional toll from an experience or the emotional reaction evoked by a specific stimulus ⁴⁸. The reader is not to be shaken over the matter of pervasive injustice, with **חפץ** denoting “business” or “concern” as in 3,1. The advice seems apropos especially to idealistic youth who enter service with the naïve impulse to change the world.

The grounds or basis for avoiding alarm is that such is to be expected in view of the hierarchy of corrupt officials. The introductory **כי** is causal ⁴⁹. The adjective **גבה** means “high”, “exalted”, “lofty”, and occurs around

⁴² T. KRÜGER, *Qoheleth* (trans. O.C. DEAN, Jr.) (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2004) 113.

⁴³ HALOT, 1744; DCH, 8.639. T. Krüger and A. Schellenberg both note the potential ambiguity in the term as relating either to “shock” (terror) or to “surprise” (amazement). They see the possible obscurity in this and other phrases as a microcosm of the entire unit, which could on the one hand extol hierarchical government or on the other critique it as leading only to injustice and oppression; see T. KRÜGER, “Meaningful Ambiguities in the Book of Qoheleth,” in *The Language of Qoheleth in Its Context. Essays in Honour of Prof. A. Schoors on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (eds. A. BERLEJUNG – P. VAN HECKE) (Leuven 2007) 64-67; A. SCHELLENBERG, *Kohelet* (ZBK; Zürich 2013) 93-94.

⁴⁴ BARTON, *Ecclesiastes*, 131.

⁴⁵ SCHOORS, *Ecclesiastes*, 408; DCH, 8.639.

⁴⁶ See H.F. VAN ROOY, “תמה”, *NIDOTTE*, 4.302.

⁴⁷ See U. BERGES, “תמה”, *TDOT*, 15.681.

⁴⁸ W. ECKHARDT – C. RIEPL, “Zur Grammatizität der Grammatik, am Beispiel der Basis G-TMH”, in *Text, Methode und Grammatik. Wolfgang Richter zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. W. RICHTER – W. GROSS – H. IRSIGLER – T. SEIDL) (St. Ottilien 1991) 41-55, here 53.

⁴⁹ STUART, *Ecclesiastes*, 184.

forty times in the OT ⁵⁰, with the verb form occurring around ninety times ⁵¹. The term connotes not merely the height of one's position but the haughtiness, elitism, and condescension that often accompany positions of power ⁵². Kugel, followed by Seow, argues that גִּבְהָ never means "high official" in the OT but always "arrogant" or "haughty" so that the verse is not necessarily criticizing governmental bureaucracy as assumed by the versions and many interpreters ⁵³. But the term in Isa 10,33 may refer figuratively to corrupt leaders who will be felled like tree branches in divine judgment ⁵⁴. In any event, the issue is not whether the term connotes arrogance, which it does, but whether it designates political leaders. The context, especially the mention of provinces in v. 8 and the king in v. 9, suggests the latter.

Gordis interprets the participle שֹׁמֵר at the end of the phrase as a substantive ("guardian [of the law]") identifying not God, the supreme watcher, as in the older rabbinical view, but the high office-holders charged with keeping the law ⁵⁵. The participle functions more likely, however, as the predicate stratifying the hierarchy of officials: "High official watches over high official, and still higher ones are over them" ⁵⁶. Thus גִּבְהָ in each instance refers to human officials ⁵⁷. The first "official" is higher in position than the second "official", with the preposition "over" designating the superior rank of the former over the latter ⁵⁸. Interpreters divide over whether the hierarchy connotes *extortion*, wherein each level of administration exploits the one below it for illicit gain ⁵⁹, or *preferment*, wherein

⁵⁰ HALOT, 171; BDB, 147; DCH, 2.298.

⁵¹ R. HENTSCHE, "גִּבְהָ", TDOT, 2.357.

⁵² G.V. SMITH and V.P. HAMILTON ("גִּבְהָ", NIDOTTE, 1.798) note that the term has both a spatial meaning and ethical thrust, with the latter connoting arrogance.

⁵³ KUGEL, "Qohelet and Money", 35; SEOW, *Ecclesiastes*, 203. BARTHOLOMEW (*Ecclesiastes*, 214 n. 4) critiques Kugel's view in that he has to emend the text to arrive at his understanding.

⁵⁴ H. BARTH, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit*. Israel und Assyria als Thema einer produktiven Neuinterpretation der Jesajaüberlieferung (WMANT; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1977) 57-58; J. BLENKINSOPP, *Isaiah 1-39* (AB; New York 2000) 261; R. BAUCKHAM ("The Messianic Interpretation of Isa 10:34 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 Baruch, and the Preaching of John the Baptist", *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 [1995] 202-216) surveys the Messianic interpretation of Isa 10,33-34 in Second Temple Judaism as an allusion to the future Davidide who would triumph over foreign dignitaries in battle.

⁵⁵ GORDIS, *Koheleth*, 250. For the rabbinical view, see Tg. RASHI, and IBN EZRA.

⁵⁶ So SCHOORS, *Ecclesiastes*, 408.

⁵⁷ GINSBURG (*Cohleth*, 345) notes that some interpreters assume the second גִּבְהָ refers to the loftiness of the throne rather than to another human official, but this assigns different meanings to the same word in a single context.

⁵⁸ STUART, *Ecclesiastes*, 183.

⁵⁹ L. LEVY, *Das Buch Qoheleth*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sadduzäismus (Leipzig 1912) 95; J.L. CRENSHAW, *Ecclesiastes* (OTL; Philadelphia, PA 1987) 118.

each level protects the one below it so as to preserve its own profits⁶⁰. Delitzsch regards the more likely sense as exploitation, with שמר here meaning an adversarial watching (cf. 1 Sam 19,11; 2 Sam 11,16), as in keeping an eye out for the moment when one might gain an advantage to leverage his own interests⁶¹. While this is possible, in the great majority of cases when used with people as the object the meaning of שמר has the more positive sense of “keeping watch over”, “protecting”, or “guarding” (Josh 10,18; 1 Sam 26,15-16; 30,23; 2 Sam 18,12; 1 Kgs 20,39)⁶². Such a reading nudges the interpreter toward the sense of preferment in “looking out for” and thus “protecting” their ranks so as to preserve the revenue stream wrested from the disadvantaged and to shield the level of corruption from the eyes of the exploited community⁶³. Rather than keeping an eye out for justice, the corrupt officials are keeping an eye out for each other — to extend their own profits and power.

The use of the plural form גִּבְהִים in the final phrase suggests at least four levels of administration. Some interpreters take the plural form in this phrase as the plural of majesty denoting God⁶⁴. Thus Staples concludes that a proper rendering of the phrase is “the most high over him” and that “each official is acting as an agent of God”⁶⁵. This is unlikely, however, as Qohelet appears to be depicting the administrative levels of a province rather than contrasting human with divine government⁶⁶. Furthermore, the fact that oppression is taking place indicates that a corrupt official, who sees no accountability for himself, tops the echelon rather than God⁶⁷. Castelli understands the hierarchy to refer instead to the angelic realm, as the angels watch over human affairs⁶⁸. A clear delineation of angelic rank appears to be a late development in Second Temple Judaism and comes to flower only in the NT (Eph 6,12; Col 1,16; 2,15; although cf. Dan 10,13.20), running contrary to the context here. Others point here to

⁶⁰ FOX, *A Time to Tear Down*, 234. A. LAUHA (*Kohelet*, 104) notes the possibility of intentional ambiguity in the selection of this term, which could mean positively “to protect” or spitefully “to surveil” or “to lie in wait for”.

⁶¹ DELITZSCH, *Ecclesiastes*, 293. See also A.H. MCNEILE, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes* (Cambridge 1904) 69.

⁶² DCH, 8.475-484.

⁶³ See KRÜGER, *Qoheleth*, 114; MURPHY, *Ecclesiastes*, 51; M.A. EATON, *Ecclesiastes* (TOTC; Downers Grove, IL 1983) 101; BROWN, *Ecclesiastes*, 58; BARTHOLOMEW, *Ecclesiastes*, 217.

⁶⁴ STUART, *Ecclesiastes*, 184.

⁶⁵ W.E. STAPLES, “Vanity of Vanities”, *Canadian Journal of Theology* 1 (1955) 154.

⁶⁶ E. PODECHARD, *L'Ecclésiaste* (Études bibliques; Paris 1912) 342.

⁶⁷ DELITZSCH, *Ecclesiastes*, 293.

⁶⁸ D. CASTELLI, *Il Libro del Cohelet* (Pisa 1866) 244; cf. IBN EZRA, *El Comentario de Abraham Ibn Ezra al Libro del Eclesiastés* (trans. and ed. M. GÓMEZ ARANDA) (Madrid 1994) 90.

the king as the highest official and suggest that the context supports reverence toward God (v. 7) and the king (v. 8)⁶⁹. This may be the case, although one wonders why the king would not be explicitly mentioned here if he is in view as in v. 8. The principle, rather, is that the hierarchical corruption is analogous to the old expression of infinite regress: elephants all the way down. Or in this case up.

Podechard notes three primary interpretations as to the advice Qohelet is giving: (1) he seeks to give confidence to the oppressed by reminding them that since government is well-ordered under divine oversight, the exploitation of the poor will be rectified by higher human officials⁷⁰; (2) he defends divine providence in affirming that although injustice may occur for a time God himself will eventually make it right⁷¹; (3) he advises that injustice in the province should come as no surprise given the large number of corrupt officials that separate the king from his people⁷². Podechard dismisses the second view, on the basis of its erroneous interpretation of גְבוּהִים as referring to God, a reading that is foreign to the context. He deems the first view as also unlikely given its assumption of a favorable view of government on the part of Qohelet and that it requires taking the terms in the verse such as תְּמָה and גְבוּהִים in a more positive vein than warranted. I concur that the third view is most likely.

Whybray interprets the hierarchy here as corresponding to the corrupt and exploitative administration of the Ptolemies during the Hellenistic period, especially under Ptolemy II Philadelphus (282-246 B.C.E.)⁷³. Athas even names Apollonius, Zenon, and Joseph Tobias as the corrupt officials Qohelet has in mind⁷⁴. To press the claims and identities here so strictly to one period and to specific individuals, however, flattens the timeless principles and power of the text. Critiques against corrupt governance appear across the corpus of ancient writings. In the Egyptian third-millennium B.C.E. wisdom tractate *Admonitions of Ipuwer*, the sage rails against the failings of the king to uphold justice⁷⁵. Likewise the poor

⁶⁹ F. HITZIG, *Der Prediger Salomo's* (KeHAT; Leipzig 21883) 245-246.

⁷⁰ So GINSBURG, *Cohleth*, 347; H.W. HERTZBERG, *Der Prediger* (KAT; Stuttgart 1963) 125; V. ZAPLETAL, *Das Buch Kohelet* (Freiburg 1911) 154; G. OGDEN, *Qoheleth* (Readings; Sheffield 1987) 80-81; D.C. FREDERICKS, *Ecclesiastes* (AOTC; Downers Grove, IL 2010) 144.

⁷¹ D.C. SIEGFRIED, *Prediger und Hoheslied* (HAT; Göttingen 1898) 51.

⁷² DELITZSCH, *Ecclesiastes*, 293; G. WILDEBOER, *Prediger* (KHAT; Freiburg 1898) 139-140; BARTON, *Ecclesiastes*, 127; McNIELE, *Ecclesiastes*, 69; G. BICKELL, *Der Prediger* (Innsbruck 1884) 97-98; LEVY, *Qoheleth*, 95.

⁷³ R.N. WHYBRAY, *Ecclesiastes* (OTG; Sheffield 1997) 19; IDEM, *Ecclesiastes* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, MI 1989) 97.

⁷⁴ ATHAS, *Ecclesiastes*, 127.

⁷⁵ N. SHUPAK (trans.), "The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage: The Admonitions of Ipuwer (1.42)", *COS* 1.97.

protagonist in *The Eloquent Peasant*, dating from the Egyptian Middle Kingdom period (ca. 2040-1650 B.C.E.), decries the perversion of justice that he has experienced, with nearly the entire narrative depicting his thwarted efforts to obtain redress from greedy and violent overlords⁷⁶. The Akkadian righteous-sufferer composition *The Babylonian Theodicy*, dating from around 1000 B.C.E., speaks in a similar vein of injustice toward the poor, as the wealthy utilize power and prestige to their advantage while the impoverished suffer without recourse⁷⁷. So Qohelet advises sobriety when encountering injustice, as it is endemic to the political administration and should come as no shock.

2. Verse 8

Qohelet validates his advice with one of the book's most difficult texts. Fox concludes that the gist can be obtained from its seven words despite the difficulties⁷⁸, while other interpreters are less optimistic⁷⁹. Aside from emending the 3fs pronoun הִיא to the 3ms הוּא as noted above, the goal of this study is to make the best sense of the Hebrew epigram. In what follows I argue that the meaning derives from three separate phrases collectively providing a slight caveat to Qohelet's earlier warning about pervasive exploitation in government⁸⁰: some mitigation of rampant corruption occurs when the highest echelon is committed to order, stability, and productivity⁸¹. This reading runs contrary to the interpretation of recent commentators who see the verse reinforcing the negative view of v. 7, viz., that the king is complicit in the corruption because he too benefits from extorting the land and its farmers⁸².

⁷⁶ M. LICHTHEIM, *Ancient Egyptian Literature, Volume 1. The Old and Middle Kingdoms* (Berkeley, CA 2006) 173.

⁷⁷ B.R. FOSTER (trans.), "The Babylonian Theodicy (1.154)", *COS* 1.495. See especially XXVI.281-286.

⁷⁸ FOX, *A Time to Tear Down*, 234.

⁷⁹ J. BOLLHAGEN (*Ecclesiastes* [Concordia; St. Louis, MO 2011] 195) opines that "there are at least as many translations as there are translators", while G.S. OGDEN – L. ZOGBO (*A Handbook on Ecclesiastes* [UBS; New York 1997] 167) concede that "we have to admit honestly that we do not know what this text means".

⁸⁰ The three clauses are as follows: "An advantage for a country — *he* is over all, viz., the king to cultivated fields".

⁸¹ DELITZSCH, *Ecclesiastes*, 293-294; OGDEN – ZOGBO, *Ecclesiastes*, 168; BARTHOLOMEW, *Ecclesiastes*, 118; KRÜGER, *Qoheleth*, 115; MURPHY, *Ecclesiastes*, 51; EATON, *Ecclesiastes*, 101-102; BOLLHAGEN, *Ecclesiastes*, 195; N. LOHFINK, *Qoheleth* (trans. S. McEVENUE) (Continental; Minneapolis, MN 2003) 81. LAUHA (*Kohelet*, 105; see also D. MICHEL, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qohelet* [BZAW; Berlin 1989] 110) takes a positive view of v. 8 but attributes the verse to a secondary, pro-monarchical hand.

⁸² LONGMAN, *Ecclesiastes*, 158-159; BELCHER, *Ecclesiastes*, 207; BROWN, *Ecclesiastes*, 59; WHYBRAY *Ecclesiastes*, 98; ENNS, *Ecclesiastes*, 70; ATHAS, *Ecclesiastes*, 129; D. HUBBARD,

Qohelet begins by noting that there is a potential advantage in a land. The opening *waw* is likely adversative: “Yet, but”. The adversative use is typically preceded by a negative construction (here: “do not be shocked”) and presents an alternative affirmation, opposition, or concession⁸³. The term יֶתְרוֹן, “advantage” or “profit”, is unique to Ecclesiastes and a keyword in the book, forming part of the programmatic question (see 1,3; 3,9). It appears ten times, including four times in collocation with another noun (the construct state but unmarked) (“advantage of wisdom”, 2,13; “advantage of the worker”, 3,9; “advantage of land”, 5,9; “advantage of knowledge”, 7,12). Wherever the term is used Qohelet speaks of a positive or actual advantage to be gained. This precedent calls into question a key point of the negative view, since the latter must understand the advantage here to be the exploited profit of corrupt officials⁸⁴. The construct-genitive relationship is the objective genitive: the assumed state (presumably “a king to cultivated fields”) profits or advantages *a land*⁸⁵.

The term אֶרֶץ denotes “land”, “ground”, “earth”, or “country”⁸⁶. SDBH defines the term as “the earth as opposed to the sky; sometimes used in a more specific sense to denote part of the earth, such as the dry land as opposed to the sea, or a specific region, area, country, or plot of land”⁸⁷. Most frequently the term connotes for Qohelet “the earth” as the sphere of human activity and as the source of primeval mankind and animals⁸⁸. On one occasion it refers to the ground or soil (“princes walking on the ground”, 10,7). Twice it refers to the country or land as the realm over which the king and princes rule (10,16.17). Several commonalities suggest a conceptual link between the present verse and 10,16-17. Only here and in these latter verses, where אֶרֶץ is personified, does the term lack the article. Only in these two contexts is the land mentioned with reference to the king. Furthermore, both contexts pose a contrast between unhappy, ill-governed lands (5,7; 10,16) and more fortunate, well-governed lands (5,8; 10,17)⁸⁹. Given the similarities, the best understanding of אֶרֶץ in the

Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs (Dallas, TX 1991) 137-138; I. PROVAN, *Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids, MI 2001) 126.

⁸³ WILLIAMS, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*, 195, §4L; P. JOÜON – T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome 2006) 393-394, §123i.

⁸⁴ See LONGMAN, *Ecclesiastes*, 159; PROVAN, *Ecclesiastes*, 126.

⁸⁵ PODECHARD (*L'Ecclésiaste*, 343) notes that the term links specifically to the beneficiary of the profit, in this case “land”.

⁸⁶ HALOT, 90-91; DCH, 1.384-397.

⁸⁷ Dahood's suggestion that אֶרֶץ denotes here “city” in contrast to “field” (שדה) is doubtful; see DAHOOD, *Ras Shamra Parallels*, 1.126; IDEM, “Phoenician Background of Qoheleth”, 280.

⁸⁸ Eccl 1,4; 3,21; 5,1; 7,20; 8,14.16; 11,2.3; 12,7.

⁸⁹ See also FOX, *A Time to Tear Down*, 234.

present verse seems to fit with its sense there as “land” or “country”. The use of שדה (“field”) as a parallel term in the latter part of the verse supports this conclusion, since when ארץ refers to a land or country שדה serves often as a subset term (Gen 23,19; 41,48; Isa 5,8; Jer 32,43-44)⁹⁰. “Land” appears here as synecdoche for those who inhabit the country — a polity of citizens rather than a plot of dirt⁹¹. For Qohelet an advantage by its very nature accrues always to people rather than to inanimate objects⁹².

Beyond proposed emendations, the meaning of the next phrase בכל (“in all”) has proved elusive. Approximately seven suggestions have been made, some with very slight shades of distinction⁹³. (1) “To/for all”: the advantage of the land pertains *to all*⁹⁴. (2) “After all”: the advantage of a land is *nevertheless/after all*⁹⁵. (3) “In all (circumstances)”: an advantage for a land *under all circumstances*⁹⁶. (4) “In everything”: the advantage of a land is *in general/in everything*⁹⁷. (5) “With/by all”: the advantage from the land is *with all* or *taken by all*⁹⁸; this can mean “with all *the rulers*” or “with all *the people*”. (6) “Above all”: the advantage of cultivating the land is *above everything/over all*⁹⁹. (7) “In all regards”: the advantage of a land is *in all regards/in all respects*¹⁰⁰.

The collocation of כָּל + הָ + בְּ is rare in the OT (Gen 16,12; 24,1; 2 Sam 23,5; 1 Chr 29,12; Ezra 10,17; Ps 103,19; Eccl 5,9). In Gen 16,12

⁹⁰ M.A. GRISANTI, “שְׂדֵי/שָׂדֶה”, *NIDOTTE*, 3.1219.

⁹¹ So GINSBURG, *Ecclesiastes*, 346; FOX, *A Time to Tear Down*, 234; OGDEN – ZOGBO, *Ecclesiastes*, 168.

⁹² See OGDEN, *Ecclesiastes*, 81.

⁹³ See SCHOORS, *Ecclesiastes*, 411.

⁹⁴ C.F. WHITLEY, *Koheleth. His Language and Thought* (BZAW; Berlin 1979) 50-51; BARTHOLOMEW, *Ecclesiastes*, 217.

⁹⁵ NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE (La Habra, CA 1995); M. THILO, *Der Prediger Salomo* (Bonn 1923) 36.

⁹⁶ WILDEBOER, *Prediger*, 140.

⁹⁷ A.F. RAINEY, “A Study of Ecclesiastes”, *CTM* 35 (1964) 151; STUART, *Ecclesiastes*, 185; PODECHARD, *L’Ecclesiaste*, 343; DELITZSCH, *Ecclesiastes*, 294-295; BARTON, *Ecclesiastes*, 127.

⁹⁸ LEVY, *Qoheleth*, 95; REVISED STANDARD VERSION (New York 1971) margin; NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION (Grand Rapids, MI 2011); NET BIBLE (Nashville, TN 1996); CHRISTIAN STANDARD BIBLE (Nashville, TN 2017); LONGMAN, *Ecclesiastes*, 157.

⁹⁹ IBN EZRA, *Ecclesiastés*, 91; HOLMSTEDT – COOK – MARSHALL, *Qoheleth*, 171; RASHI.

¹⁰⁰ ENGLISH STANDARD VERSION (Wheaton, IL 2011); SCHOORS, *Ecclesiastes*, 411-412; FOX, *A Time to Tear Down*, 234; BOLLHAGEN, *Ecclesiastes*, 195; F. BACKHAUS, “Die Pendenkonstruktionen im Buch Qohelet”, *ZAH* 8 (1995) 1-30, here 22. The distinction between 4 and 7 is slight. The fourth option appears to have a slightly stronger locative nuance, while the seventh option signifies concern for or respect to all things. Also the distinction between 1 and 5 is minor, although perhaps more pronounced if the latter is speaking of the ruling class. The first option indicates the potential of a share and has a more positive connotation, while the fifth option has that share actualized in possession with the nuance of corruption.

the כ carries adversative force: “With his hand *against everyone*, and everyone’s hand against him”. The preposition has the customary locative sense of “in everything” in two texts. In Gen 24,1 the phrase emphasizes YHWH’s plenitude of blessing toward Abraham: “The LORD had blessed Abraham *in all things*”. In 2 Sam 23,5 David extols the covenant YHWH had made with him, a covenant “ordered *in all things*”. In the postexilic Ezra 10,17 the preposition designates the direct object (*beth* of transitivity) of the verb כלה: “They finished *with respect to all* the men” (בכל אנשים)¹⁰¹. In two other passages the phrase likewise carries a locative sense but here with the superlative connotation of YHWH’s universal dominion over the created order. In 1 Chr 29,12 the phrase describes YHWH’s rule over creation: “You rule *over all*”. And in Ps 103,19 the phrase denotes his universal kingdom: “His kingdom rules *over all*”. These latter two texts share with Eccl 5,8 a range of terms from the lexical field of sovereignty/rule: “rule” (משל) (1 Chr 29,12; Ps 103,19); “kingdom” (ממלכה/מלכות) (1 Chr 29,11; Ps 103,19); “king” (מלך) (Eccl 5,9); “heavens/earth” (שמים/ארץ) (1 Chr 29,11; Ps 103,19; Eccl 5,9); and “throne” (כסא) (Ps 103,19). These lexical ties suggest a similar connotation here of “over all” or “above all”, as the prepositional phrase denotes the sphere over which the rule is exerted.

I follow a majority of interpreters in emending the *Kethib* 3fs pronoun היא to the *Qere* 3ms pronoun הוא. This construction signifies an initial left-dislocated phrase (“an advantage of a country”), resumed by the pronoun הוא functioning as the subject of the predicate. Some take the pronoun as relating back to יתרון, a masculine noun: “An advantage to a country — it is over everything a king to a cultivated field”¹⁰². This construction appears to make sense of the epigram but connects rather awkwardly to the preceding and still leaves unexplained the meaning of the final clause. Holmstedt – Cook – Marshall take the pronoun הוא as a proleptic reference to the king and translate the latter part of the verse as “he is over everything, a king of an arable country”¹⁰³. This construal appears to make better sense of the verse by seeing three independent phrases, with the middle phrase assuming a nominal clause function as *casus pendens* for the final phrase: “An advantage for a country — *he* is over all, viz., the king to cultivated fields”.

¹⁰¹ The author’s translation.

¹⁰² STUART, *Ecclesiastes*, 185; LONGMAN, *Ecclesiastes*, 159.

¹⁰³ HOLMSTEDT – COOK – MARSHALL, *Qoheleth*, 171-172. The authors explain (171): “As the text stands, the first half appears to present a left-dislocation (יתרון ארץ) followed by a null copula clause with the complement (בכל, which resumes the dislocated יתרון by semantic coreference) and the subject, הוא”. See also BOLLHAGEN, *Ecclesiastes*, 195.

The final clause begins with the term מֶלֶךְ, “king”, “ruler”¹⁰⁴. Although some take this as the supreme King, God who rules over all¹⁰⁵, this understanding is foreign to the context, which deals with political corruption, and to the tenor of the book, as *king* refers always to the human monarch¹⁰⁶. Following this comes the prepositional phrase לְ + שָׂדֶה (“to a field”), which occurs as here only three times in the OT (Neh 12,44; 13,10; Eccl 5,9). The term שָׂדֶה itself is pervasive (over 320×) and means “pasture”, “territory”, “fields”, or “arable land”¹⁰⁷. The term often denotes “open fields” in contrast to the inhabited ground of the village or city, the “region of a people, tribe, or family” in contrast to the uninhabited wastelands, or the “arable land” in contrast to the desert or wilderness¹⁰⁸. Which purview is precisely in view is difficult to determine, but the evidence tilts toward the third sense when viewed in conjunction with the final word of the verse. The last word is the Niphal participle form (or possibly *qatal*) of עָבַד, meaning “to be tilled”, “be cultivated”, or perhaps here “be served”¹⁰⁹. The Niphal of עָבַד occurs only four times in the OT (Deut 21,4; Eccl 5,9; Ezek 36,9,34) and once in the Dead Sea Scrolls (The Temple Scroll A [11QT] 63,2). In two of the four OT texts Niphal עָבַד appears with the Niphal form of זָרַע as a conventional word pair signifying land that is “tilled and sown”. In Deut 21,4 the term refers to a streambed with ever-flowing water and soil that has been neither *plowed/cultivated* nor sown (preserved also in 11QT). YHWH addresses the mountains of Israel in Ezek 36,9 and promises that in the future they will be *tilled* and sown, while the desolate places will be *cultivated* (36,34). Strengthening this verbal nuance is the collocation of עָבַד with שָׂדֶה in Gen 2,5, where the phrase denotes to “work” or “cultivate” the ground. This usage is analogous to the more frequent collocation of עָבַד with אֲדָמָה (“ground”) in the sense of tilling land (Gen 2,5; 3,23; 4,2,12; 2 Sam 9,10; Prov 12,11; 28,19; Isa 30,24; Zech 13,5). Likewise, the translations of LXX, Theodotion, Symmachus, Peshitta, and Jerome support the nuance here of “cultivated field”¹¹⁰.

With this background in mind, the Niphal participle of עָבַד has been understood in four ways: (1) adjectival use modifying שָׂדֶה (“cultivated field”) ¹¹¹;

¹⁰⁴ HALOT, 591.

¹⁰⁵ E.W. HENGSTENBERG, *A Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (n.p. 1960) 142; H.C. LEUPOLD, *Exposition of Ecclesiastes* (reprint ed.; Grand Rapids, MI 1983) 124.

¹⁰⁶ Eccl 1,1,12; 2,8,12; 4,13,14; 5,9; 8,2,4; 9,14; 10,16-17,20.

¹⁰⁷ HALOT, 1307-1309; DCH, 8,112-114.

¹⁰⁸ NIDOTTE, 3,1217-1218.

¹⁰⁹ BDB, 713; HALOT, 774; DCH, 6,214; GESENIUS, *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament* (trans. S.P. TREGELLES) (reprint ed.; Grand Rapids, MI 1949) 598.

¹¹⁰ See SEOW, *Ecclesiastes*, 204.

¹¹¹ RSV; NRSV; ESV; NEW AMERICAN BIBLE (Washington, D.C. 2010); COMMON ENGLISH BIBLE (Nashville, TN 2011); BOLLHAGEN, *Ecclesiastes*, 196.

(2) adjectival use modifying מֶלֶךְ (“king who cultivates”) ¹¹²; (3) verbal use with שָׂדֵה as subject (“a field is cultivated”) ¹¹³; or (4) verbal use with מֶלֶךְ as subject (“a king is served [or, “is subject to]”) ¹¹⁴. Of the four options, the final one, although popular with contemporary English versions, seems unlikely since the Niphal form of עָבַד everywhere else in the OT denotes cultivated soil (admittedly with few examples) and since the term עָבַד generally when collocated with the semantic domain of fields or land signifies tilling or cultivation. Although Ginsburg objects that for this meaning Qohelet should have used אֲדָמָה rather than אֶרֶץ/שָׂדֵה, this argues from silence and ignores the combination of these terms in Gen 2,5. The nuance of שָׂדֵה emphasizes that the king is so committed to orderliness and productivity that he turns wildlands into farmlands. The second option is also unlikely given the syntactical distance between the verb and מֶלֶךְ. The syntax is more likely to involve the preposition לְ governing the entire phrase. The latter point favors the first option above (“cultivated field”). There are several examples elsewhere in the OT where constructions featuring לְ + a noun + a participle has the participle modifying the noun and comprising part of the prepositional phrase (Gen 49,15 [“to forced labor”]; Exod 9,9 [“to erupting boils”]; cf. 2 Sam 8,2; Neh 2,16; Job 30,31; Ps 22,32; Prov 22,7). This leads to the conclusion that the final clause should be read along the lines of “a king to a cultivated field”. The land is more than simply “arable”, which denotes merely the potential for agriculture, so “cultivated” is preferable ¹¹⁵.

From this analysis I arrive, perhaps circuitously, at my proposed translation: “Yet a king over all who is devoted to cultivated fields is an advantage to a country”. As Delitzsch concludes, the epigram commends the country “whose king takes pride, not in bloody conquests and tyrannical caprice, but in the peaceful promotion of the welfare of his people”. He is “an agriculture-king — one who is addicted, not to wars, lawsuits, and sovereign stubbornness in his opinions, but who delights in the peaceful advancement of the prosperity of his country, and especially takes a lively

¹¹² NASB.

¹¹³ NEW ENGLISH BIBLE (Oxford 1970).

¹¹⁴ CSB; NET; NIV; KJV; NEW JERUSALEM BIBLE (New York 1985); NEW KING JAMES VERSION (Nashville, TN 1982); GINSBURG, *Ecclesiastes*, 346; RASHI; IBN EZRA, *Ecclesiastes*, 91; LOADER, *Ecclesiastes*, 60. The lexicons provide little clarity, as the glosses suggested are “a king who serves the land” (*HALOT*, 774; *BDB*, 713); “a king devoted to the cultivated field” (*BDB*, 713 [rated as doubtful]); or “a king is served by means of the field” (*DCH*, 6.214). Also the Masoretic accentuation joins שָׂדֵה with נֶעֱבָד in most editions but joins the former term with מֶלֶךְ in other editions (see McNIELE, *Ecclesiastes*, 69).

¹¹⁵ OGDEN – ZOGBO, *Ecclesiastes*, 168.

interest in husbandry and the cultivation of land”¹¹⁶. King Uzziah exemplified such a posture toward agriculture and animal husbandry: “He built towers in the wilderness and hewed out many cisterns, for he had large herds, both in the Shephelah and in the plain, and he had farmers and vinedressers in the hills and in the fertile lands, for he loved the soil” (2 Chr 26,10). Solomon likewise achieved renown for his insights into flora and fauna: “He would speak of trees, from the cedar that is in the Lebanon to the hyssop that grows in the wall; he would speak of animals, and birds, and reptiles, and fish” (1 Kgs 4,33). The struggle and oscillation between political corruption vis-à-vis orderly and wise governance have been observable since the inception of human government, and such situations are therefore not unique to the Persian or Greek periods¹¹⁷. The king’s commitment to order, stability, and productivity mitigates in some measure the rampant corruption so common to political administration.

V. IMPLICATIONS FOR QOHELET’S VIEW OF LEADERSHIP

Many scholars argue that in Ecclesiastes Qohelet assumes the guise of a kingly protagonist to propound his “royal fiction”, whereby he uses an elaborate form of role playing to communicate his values and wisdom instruction¹¹⁸. One of the lines of evidence used to support this view is Qohelet’s allegedly negative view of leadership. For example, Qohelet complains about injustice in 3,16: “Moreover I saw under the sun that in the place of justice, wickedness was there, and in the place of righteousness, wickedness was there as well”. In 4,1 Qohelet laments the abuse of power he has witnessed in leaders who oppress their citizens: “Again I saw all the oppressions that are practiced under the sun. Look, the tears of the oppressed — with no one to comfort them! On the side of their oppressors there was power — with no one to comfort them”. Qohelet criticizes in a similar vein the “old but foolish king, who will no longer take advice” (4,13), contrasting him with a poor but wise youth who will at least listen

¹¹⁶ DELITZSCH, *Ecclesiastes*, 293-295.

¹¹⁷ E. GOH (“Political Wisdom in the Book of Ecclesiastes”, *Asia Journal of Theology* 30 [Apr 2016] 32) argues that 5,7-8 reflects Persian political structures, and G. ATHAS (*Ecclesiastes*, 127-129) relates the verses to the Ptolemaic period.

¹¹⁸ See R. LUX, “‘Ich, Kohelet, bin König. . .’: Die Fiktion als Schlüssel zur Wirklichkeit in Kohelet 1,12 – 2,26”, *ET* 50 (1990) 331-342; M.V. FOX, *Qohelet and His Contradictions* (eds. D.J.A. CLINES – P.R. DAVIES) (JSOTSS; Sheffield 1989) 174; O. LORETZ, *Qohelet und der alte Orient. Untersuchungen zu Stil und theologischer Thematik des Buches Qohelet* (Freiburg 1964) 62-63; and C.-L. SEOW, “Qohelet’s Autobiography”, in *Fortunate the Eyes That See. Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman* (eds. A.B. BECK – A.H. BARTLET – P.R. BAABE – C.A. FRANKE) (Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 279-287; Y.V. KOH, *Royal Autobiography in the Book of Qoheleth* (BZAW; Berlin 2006) 28-29.

to counsel. He emphasizes the hazard of contravening the king's command: "The word of the king is powerful, and who can say to him, 'What are you doing?'" (8,4). Furthermore, Qohelet is wary of the danger that sinister kings pose in 10,20, advising against openly censuring the king: "Do not curse the king, even in your thoughts, or curse the rich, even in your bedroom; for a bird of the air may carry your voice, or some winged creature tell the matter". If Qohelet really were king, this argument contends, such complaints would be out of place for one in a position to change Israel's political and judiciary system ¹¹⁹.

The conclusions offered in this paper provide a modest caution against interpreting Qohelet as entirely negative toward leaders. While certainly Qohelet cautions against the abuse of power in several texts, my proposed reading of 5,7-8 offers at least one context in which Qohelet commends a wise, just, and restrained king. The king who is committed to order, stability, and productivity provides some stay to the rampant corruption so common to political administration. This text, then, should be classed with 10,17, where Qohelet highlights wise and noble kingship: "Happy are you, O land, when your king is a nobleman, and your princes feast at the proper time — for strength, and not for drunkenness!" While my proposed understanding certainly falls short of reorienting entirely questions of authorship, it does nonetheless furnish a puzzle piece for a more nuanced understanding of Qohelet's view of leadership. The king is not always the villain in Ecclesiastes; here he provides a boon to the country. Royal power is not intrinsically illegitimate. The king may, in fact, offer an antidote to the political corruption observed everywhere under the sun. Such a conclusion at least makes possible that the author of Ecclesiastes is, therefore, himself a royal figure.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have argued that Eccl 5,7-8 presents a positive view of kingship when the king serves to mitigate otherwise rampant political corruption. The king who is committed to order, stability, and productivity provides an advantage to his country. Rather than categorizing Eccl 5,7-8 as another indication of Qohelet's negative view of leadership, a preferable reading sees him affirming the proper use of royal power when the king is exercising his office properly. While Qohelet is keen to address themes of poverty and oppression, he offsets these concerns somewhat by concluding

¹¹⁹ See LONGMAN, *Ecclesiastes*, 6.

that hierarchical levels of oversight, culminating in the king, offer some explanation (5,7) and ideally some restraint (5,8) for corruption, however infrequent and imperfect. A proper king results in a happy people. Qohelet underscores how rare and yet how valuable such a reality is.

Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary
4801 Allen Road
Allen Park, Michigan 48101 (U.S.A.)
kdunham@dbts.edu

Kyle C. DUNHAM

SUMMARY

Qohelet's critique of royal leadership in Eccl 5,7-8 (8-9) constitutes one of the book's most difficult texts. Recent scholarship has moved toward understanding both verses as a criticism of corrupt government, in that the king is complicit in the graft because he too profits from exploiting the land and its farmers. Such a reading comports with the nearly uniform approach to Ecclesiastes in recent scholarship whereby Qohelet is understood as espousing an explicitly negative view of political leadership. In this essay I argue for a fresh understanding of the verses, based on discourse analysis, that favors an older, principally Continental view. In this proposed reading v. 8 offsets v. 7, with the king viewed positively as a mitigation to rampant political corruption when he is committed to order, stability, and productivity. Rather than serving as another pronouncement of Qohelet's negative view of leadership, Eccl 5,7-8 affirms the proper use of royal power when the king exercises his office legitimately.

THE VOCABULARY OF MARK'S GOSPEL, THE LXX, AND THE GREEK OF ITS TIME

I. INTRODUCTION

There are several elements which connect Mark's Gospel with the books and the narrative of the LXX ¹. First, there are common idioms: "son of man" (Dan 7,13-14); "the abomination of desolation" (Dan 11,31); "son of David" (Ps 17,21); "corner stone" (Ps 118,22); "what do we have to do with you?" (Judg 11,12). Second, there are expressions not found in non-biblical Greek: καὶ ἐγένετο; καὶ εὐθύς; καθὼς γέγραπται; ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν; ἰδοὺ. Third, syntax, largely devoid of Atticist traits, is strongly influenced by the LXX as reflected in its paratactic style and the use of verbal periphrasis: ἤρξατο + infinitive; and ἦν + participle. There are cases of grammaticalization by the influence of the LXX in Mark in the verbs of speaking (εἶπεν, ἀποκριθεὶς), in the verbs of movement (ἐλθὼν, καταλιπὼν), in postural verbs, in certain conjunctions (ὅτι 102x; ἵνα 64x) and in adverbs (τότε 6x; εὐθύς 41x) ². Fourth, the literary style (paratactic) exhibits a scarce use of particles ³ (ἄρα 2x; μὲν δέ 3x; οὖν 3x, while οὖν appears 200x in John; δέ 152x while in Matthew 421x and in Luke 478x). In this regard, Swete once asserted that Mark "was intimately acquainted with the language of the Greek Bible" ⁴. Fifth, through a worldview ⁵ and a world of the text Mark aims to continue the narrative of God's action in favor of his people, as it was written in the LXX books. Sixth, characters reappear, such as Moses and Elijah (Mark 9,4), not to mention all the characters referred to in the narrative (Abraham, David, etc.). Seventh, there are quotations and allusions to the books of the LXX ⁶.

¹ The LXX is a set of books, written from III BCE to I BCE. Most of them are the Greek translation of the original Hebrew (and Aramaic) books of the OT, while several of them were composed in Greek.

² S.-I. LEE, *Jesus and Gospel Traditions in Bilingual Context. A Study in the Interdirectionality of Language* (BZNW 186; Berlin 2012) 252-281.

³ Mark wrote in a coherent low style but he is capable of a superior style; for example, in Jesus' direct speeches the number of particles increases. See J.A.L. LEE, "Some Features of the Speech of Jesus in Mark's Gospel", *NovT* 27 (1985) 1-26.

⁴ H.B. SWETE, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London 1898) lxxx.

⁵ M. NEL, "The Gospel of Mark in Light of its Apocalyptic Worldview", *Journal of Early Christian History* 4 (2014) 135-148.

⁶ The Gospel has 69 quotations from the books of the LXX. Half of these citations are from the Prophets, namely 37 from Isaiah and 9 from Daniel. There are 19 from the

including one explicit reference to Isaiah at the beginning of the Gospel, introduced by a stereotyped formula belonging to the LXX and reclaiming its authority: καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφῆτῃ (Mark 1,2; 2Kgs 14,6 LXX). The concepts of style and intertextuality are especially persuasive in establishing the connection between the NT and the LXX. Imitation and allusion are the strategies through which Mark pays homage to the Septuagint as Holy Scripture ⁷.

Given this close relationship between Mark's Gospel and the LXX books, a number of questions arise. What is the relationship between the LXX and Mark's vocabularies? Was Mark's Gospel composed with LXX words? Does its vocabulary indicate a specific relationship with the LXX? What is the relationship of Mark's vocabulary with the Greek of its time? Was Mark's vocabulary affected more by Classical words or by new words coming from Koine Greek?

Mark's vocabulary has been studied previously, but it was done with the objectives of determining its hypothetical sources and identifying its specific theology ⁸. No significant studies of the vocabulary of the NT and its relationship with the Septuagint or with Classical Greek have been produced since those that were published over a hundred years ago ⁹. These studies perpetuated several errors resulting from a scarcity of sources and tools. But with the discovery of new papyri and inscriptions and the publication of new dictionaries, as well as new digital tools, further study in

Pentateuch and 12 from the Psalms. R.E. WATTS, "Mark", *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (eds. G.K. BEALE – D.A. CARSON) (Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 111-250, here 111. In the Index of the NA²⁸ more than 350 references from the OT appear in Mark. There are references to every book of the LXX with the exception of 1 Chronicles, 3 Maccabees, Obadiah, Nahum, and Habakkuk.

⁷ M. WEIGER, "Le Vocabulaire de la Septante dans le Nouveau Testament", *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint* (eds. E. BONS – J. JOOSTEN) (LXX.H 3; Gütersloh 2016) 440-450, here 450.

⁸ F. NEIRYNCK, *Duality in Mark*. Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction (BETL 31; Leuven ²1988). E.J. PRYKE, *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel*. A Study of Syntax and Vocabulary as Guides to Redaction in Mark (Cambridge 1978). J.C. DOUDNA, *The Greek of the Gospel of Mark* (Philadelphia, PA 1961). Head points out the difficulty of establishing a clear list of Markan words. P.M. HEAD, "Mark's Vocabulary: A Survey of Approaches and Material", *Estudios Bíblicos* 79 (2021) 78-108, here 83-95. My analysis of these lists reveals that only four words do not appear in the LXX: μαθητής, κράβατος, συζητέω and σταυρός (σταυρόω appears in LXX), and only μεθερμηνεύω is post-Classical.

⁹ H.A.A. KENNEDY, *Sources of New Testament Greek*. The Influence of the Septuagint on the Vocabulary of the New Testament (Edinburgh 1895). T.K. ABBOTT, *Essays Chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments* (London 1891). M. SILVA, "The Language of the Septuagint and the New Testament: Prolegomena", *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint* (eds. E. BONS – J. JOOSTEN) (LXX.H 3; Gütersloh 2016) 431-439.

these areas is now called for ¹⁰. In fact, Edwin A. Judge asserted that over the fifty years between the publication of Moulton and Milligan's book (1930) and the first volume of the *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (1976), the number of volumes with publications of documentary papyri showed a five-fold increase ¹¹. This situation calls for a new study of Mark's vocabulary.

II. AIM AND METHOD

The objective of this article is to analyse the relationship of the vocabulary of Mark with the vocabulary of the Septuagint and to place Mark's vocabulary in the context of first-century CE Greek, with the goal of determining whether Mark's vocabulary may reflect the author's attempt to connect his story with the LXX. In order to achieve this, firstly Mark's vocabulary will be contrasted with the LXX's vocabulary. Secondly, the relationship of the vocabulary of other contemporary works close to Mark's Gospel will be contrasted and compared with the LXX. These works have been chosen because of their Jewish register ¹² (Paul, Josephus, Philo, *Joseph and Aseneth*) or because of their closeness to Mark in terms of literary genre ¹³ (*Life of Apollonius*, *Evagoras*, *Agésilas*) or linguistic variety (Polybius, Epictetus). Thirdly, Mark's vocabulary will be placed in its contemporary context to assess previous results and to understand his semantic influences. It must be pointed out that the linguistic study of the Gospel should be carried out by analysing its genre, linguistic variety, style, register, syntax and vocabulary ¹⁴. In this article we focus on vocabulary.

The method of analysis of Mark's vocabulary adopted here is centered on the linguistic written forms (the symbols) and not on their meanings

¹⁰ Especially significant new dictionaries are F. MONTANARI, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (Boston, MA 2015) (GE) and T. MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven 2009) (GELS).

¹¹ E.A. JUDGE, "Preface", *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1976 (ed. G.H.R. HORSLEY) (NewDocs 1; North Ryde, Australia 1971) iv-v, here v.

¹² Register is a set of language items associated with social groups, specific occupations or institutions. R. WARDHAUGH, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (West Sussex, UK 2010) 52. Register entails text and implies a relationship between text and context. D. BIBER – E. FINEGAN, *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register* (Oxford 1994) 7.

¹³ These works have been taken as "genre models" close to Mark by R.A. BURRIDGE, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Grand Rapids, MI 2004).

¹⁴ A. DELGADO GÓMEZ, "Género y registro del evangelio de Marcos desde la perspectiva sociolingüística", *Estudios Agustianianos* 53 (2018) 5-36.

or senses, which would require a different approach ¹⁵. This study is a corpus-based linguistic analysis of the vocabulary of the Gospel of Mark compared with three other corpora: first, the corpus formed by the books of the LXX; second, texts written in Koine Greek (documentary and literary); and third, literary texts written in Classical Greek before Aristotle.

This analysis has been carried out using the NA²⁸ Greek text of Mark's Gospel and Ralph's text of the LXX. The results have been verified using Morgenthaler's statistics ¹⁶, which have been verified and corrected. The works of Isocrates, Xenophon, Epictetus, Philostratus and Polybius in the Perseus and TLG's editions have been analysed after creating new modules for Bibleworks 10 and then comparing them to the biblical texts. The definitions and etymologies are derived from GE and have been verified in EGD ¹⁷ and also in Chantraine ¹⁸. The words and their attestations have been analysed using a number of dictionaries: GE, GI ¹⁹, DGE ²⁰, LSJ ²¹, BDAG ²², MM ²³, Thayer ²⁴, Preisigke ²⁵, *NewDocs* ²⁶; Mauersberger²⁷ for Polybius and GELS and LEH for the LXX ²⁸. The attestation of the words in papyri and inscriptions have also been studied using a number of databases ²⁹.

¹⁵ M. JANSE, "The Greek of the New Testament", *A History of Ancient Greek*. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity (ed. A.F. CHRISTIDIS) (Cambridge 2007) 646-653.

¹⁶ R. MORGENTHAUER, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich 1958). Contrary to him, in this study only Mark 1.1 – 16.8 is taken into account.

¹⁷ R.S.P. BEEKES – L. VAN BEEK, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden 2010) (EDG).

¹⁸ P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Histoire des mots (Paris 1999).

¹⁹ F. MONTANARI – D. MANETTI – I. GAROFALO, *Vocabolario della lingua greca*. Greco-italiano (Torino ²2004).

²⁰ F. RODRÍGUEZ ADRADOS – J.A. BERENGUER, *Diccionario griego-español* (Madrid ²2008) (DGL).

²¹ H.G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT – H.S. JONES, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford ⁹1996) (LSJ).

²² W. BAUER – W.F. ARNDT – F.W. DANKER, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, IL ³2000).

²³ J.H. MOULTON – G. MILLIGAN, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources (London 1929) (MM).

²⁴ J.H. THAYER – C.L.W. GRIMM – C.G. WILKE, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York ²1889).

²⁵ F. PREISIGKE – E. KIESSLING – O. GRADENWITZ, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin 1925) and the next supplements.

²⁶ G.H.R. HORSLEY – S.R. LLEWELYN, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (North Ryde, Australia 1981-2012) (*NewDocs*).

²⁷ A. MAUERSBERGER – C.-F. COLLATZ – H. HELMS, et al., *Polybios-Lexikon* (Berlin ²2000).

²⁸ J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Berlin 2003).

²⁹ E.g., papyri.info, trismegistos.org, PHI Greek Inscriptions, and D. HAGEDORN – K. MARECH, *WörterListen aus den Registern von Publikationen griechischer und lateinischer dokumentarischer Papyri und Ostraka* (Heidelberg 2018) (WL).

III. VOCABULARY OF MARK IN THE LXX

1. *Words appearing in the LXX*

Mark's Gospel consists of approximately 11,133 words related to 1,315 lemmas³⁰. After comparing Mark's vocabulary with that of the LXX, the outcome is that only 183 lemmas in the Gospel do not appear in the Septuagint, representing 10.23% of the total lemmas³¹. Excluding proper names³², place names, demonyms³³, and collectives³⁴, and two words with different transcription in the LXX³⁵, only 128 lemmas of the total lemmas do not appear in the LXX. These words are shown in Table 1, with their attestations and morphology³⁶.

There are only 12 lemmas used in Mark's Gospel which only appear in the LXX³⁷ and are not attested elsewhere³⁸. This confirms that the use of neologisms from the LXX in Mark is scarce. Seven of them are: ἀμήν (14×), ἀναθεματίζω, οὐαί, πειρασμός, προσάββατον³⁹, σατανᾶς (6×), σκληροκαρδία. The remaining five words appear in Mark as part of explicit quotations from the LXX: τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως (Dan 12,11); ἔνταλμα (Isa 29,13); δλοκαύτωμα (Lev 14,31); προσευχή (Isa 56,7).

Mark shares with the five books of the Greek Pentateuch 487 lemmas (63%) and uses 48 specific words appearing only in the Deuterocanonical

³⁰ 618 words used only once, 227 only twice, 99 three times, 68 four times. PRYKE, *Redactional Style*, 28. See the interesting reflection about the exact number of Mark's words in HEAD, "Mark's Vocabulary", 80-83.

³¹ Of Mark's 1,315 lemmas, 2,806 types, and 11,133 tokens, only 128 lemmas (10%), 819 types (29%), and 1,116 tokens (10%) do not overlap with LXX. This means that the distribution of those words is consistent. And these outcomes should be reduced due to the presence of proper names in this comparison with the LXX corpus available.

³² Ἰσκαριώθ, Βεελζεβούλ, Καῖσαρ (4×) and Γολγοθᾶ are also excluded in the statistics.

³³ γερασινός, ναζαρινός, μαγδαληνή, καναναῖος, γαλιλαῖος [Γαλιλαία (1Kgs 9,12)], συροφοινίκισσα [Συρία (2Sam 8,5) + φοίνικες (Deut 3,9 מִיִּדְיָא)]. Ἱεροσολυμίτης appears in Sir 50,27 and 4Macc 4,22; Κυρηναῖος in 2Macc 2,23 and Ἑλληνίς in 2Macc 6,8.

³⁴ Ἡρωδιανοί, σαδδουκαῖος and φαρισαῖος. These last two appear in Josephus.

³⁵ τεσσεράκοντα = τεσσαράκοντα (Gen 5,13); τηλαυγῶς = τηλαυγής (Lev 13,24).

³⁶ Five complex words are: εἶθθα (Mark 10,1) appears 4× in LXX; δύνω ("to go down") in 2Chr 18,34; κεφαλαιώ ("to strike on the head") in Sir 32,8. According to EGD σκύλλω and σκύλον could come from the same root.

³⁷ See Table 6. There are 1,900 neologisms in the LXX according to Muraoka's Dictionary (GELS, xiii), which would represent approximately 10%. J.K. AITKEN, "Neologisms: A Septuagint Problem", *Interested Readers*. Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David J.A. Clines (eds. J.K. AITKEN – C. MAIER – J. CLINES) (Atlanta, GA 2013) 315-329.

³⁸ Of those 34 words identified by Morgenthaler as specific to the LXX the majority are subsequently attested in Classical or post-Classical authors, inscriptions and papyri. MORGENTHALER, *Statistik*, 176.

³⁹ σάββατον is also attested in P.Cair. Zen. 4 59762 (III BCE) and BGU 20 2846 (50 BCE).

and Apocryphal books of the LXX, which is an aftermath of the normal evolution of the language ⁴⁰.

Table 1 – 128 Words not in the LXX

LEMMA	ATESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
CLASSICAL AND HELLENISTIC WORDS		
ἄσβεστος	Homer, Plato, Josephus, Philo.	ἀ priv. + σβεστός Lev 6,2
ἄνιπτος	Homer, Hesiod, Philo.	ἀ priv. + νίπτω Gen 18,4
ἀχειροποίητος	Pherecydes (DGE).	ἀ priv. + χειροποίητος Lev 26,1
ἄλεκτοροφωνία	Aesop, Strabo.	ἄλεκτωρ + φωνή Prov 30,31 + Gen 29,11
ἄλλαχοῦ	Xenophon, Josephus, Philo.	ἄλλος Gen 19,12
ἀνασεῖω	Thucydides, Xenophon, Plutarch, Josephus, Philo.	ἀνά + σεῖω Judg 5,4
ἄναλος	Aristophanes, Strabo.	ἀνά + ἄλας (GE) ἄλς, ἄλας Sir 39,26, ἄλς Gen 14,3
ἀνάγαιον	Philo Mechanicus [ἀνώγαιον in Xenophon]. PSI 709.17 (VI BCE) [ἀνάγαιον SB 3 7267 (184 BCE); ἀνάγαιος P.Oxy 79].	ἄνω + γαῖα Exod 20,4 + 2 Kgs 18,35
ἀποδημέω	Plato, Herodotus, Josephus, Philo.	ἀπό + δῆμος Num 1,20
ἀπόδημος	Plato, Aristotle, Josephus.	ἀπό + δῆμος Num 1,20
ἀποστεγάζω	Aristotle, Empedocles, Strabo, Athenaeus.	ἀπό + στεγάζω Ps 103,3
ἀπόστολος (2×)	Demosthenes, Plato, Josephus.	ἀποστέλλω Gen 2,8
ἀσπασμός	Plato, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch [ἀσπάζομαι in Polybius].	ἀσπάζομαι Exod 18,7
γενέσια	Herodotus, Josephus, Plutarch.	γένεσις Gen 2,4
γονυπετέω (2×)	Euripides, Polybius.	γόνυ + πέτομαι Deut 28,35 + Job 20,8
δαιμονίζομαι (4×)	Philemon (IV BCE), Josephus, Plutarch [εὐδαιμονίζοντες P.Herc 1050 (I BCE)].	δαίμων Isa 65,11
διαβλέπω	Plato, Plutarch.	διά + βλέπω Gen 45,12

⁴⁰ ἀγανακτέω, ἀκυρώω, ἄλας, ἄλυσις, ἀνάκειμαι, ἀνακλίνω, ἀπάτη, ἀπιστία, ἀσέλγεια, ἄφθαρτος, δαπανάω, διαγίνομαι, ἐκθαμβέω, ἐκθαυμάζω, ἐλληνίς, ἔννουχος, εὐκαίρως, εὐκοπος, εὐχαριστέω, κατευλογέω, κοινός, κτίσις, κυρηναῖος, μεθερμηνεύω, νυμφόν, ὀψία, πάντοτε, παρασκευή, περίκειμαι, πήρα, ποταπός, πρασιά, προλαμβάνω, πρόσκαιρος, προσμένω, σατανάς, σκανδαλίζω, σπεῖρα, σπλαγχνίζομαι, στρατιώτης, συμβούλιον, συνακολουθέω, συνανάκειμαι, συναποθνήσκω, ὑπόκρισις, φανερώς, φάντασμα, φθόνος.

LEMMA	ATESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
διακονέω (5×)	Plato, Xenophon, Josephus, Philo.	διακονία 1Macc 11,58, διάκονος Prov 10,4
δυσκόλως	Xenophon, Isocrates, Josephus, Philo.	δύσκολος Jer 30,2
ἐκπνέω (2×)	Aristotle, Plato, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch.	ἐκ + πνέω Ep. Jer 1,60
ἐκφύω	Homer, Plato, Euripides, Josephus, Philo.	ἐκ + φύω Exod 10,5
ἐμβάπτω	Xenophon, Aristophanes. Athenaeus (III CE).	ἐν + βάπτω Exod 12,22
ἐπιγραφή (2×)	Plato, Thucydides, Isocrates, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch. BGU 6 1443	ἐπί + γραφή Exod 32,16
ἐπιλύω	Xenophon, Euripides, Josephus, Philo.	ἐπί + λύω Gen 42,27
ἐπιρρίπτω	Theophrastus, Galen.	ἐπί + ῥάπτω Gen 3,7
ἐσχάτως	Xenophon, Aristotle, Polybius, Philo.	ἔσχατος Gen 33,2
ἱματίζω	Plato, Xenophon, Josephus, Thucydides. WL.	ἱμάτιον 1Macc 11,58
μαθητής (46×)	Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle.	μανθάνω Exod 2,4
μονόφθαλμος	Herodotus, Strabo.	μονο + ὀφθαλμός Exod 21,24
μυρίζω	Isocrates, Plato, Herodotus, Aristotle.	μύρον Exod 30,25
νουνεχῶς	Aristotle, Polybius, Plutarch, Josephus [νουνεχῆς in Euripides].	νοῦς + ἔχω Isa 10,7
παρόμοιος	Aristotle, Herodotus, Xenophon, Thucydides.	παρά + ὅμοιος Job 35,8
πετρώδης	Thucydides, Sophocles, Aristotle, Plato, Polybius, Plutarch.	πέτρος + ὥδης, πέτρα Exod 17,6
πιστικός	Plato, Artemidorus Daldianus (II CE).	πίστις Deut 32,20
προαύλιον	Plato, Aristotle, Pollux (II CE).	πρό + αὐλή Exod 27,9
προσαίτης	Isocrates, Xenophon, Aristophanes, Plutarch.	πρός + αἰτέω 2Macc 7,10
προσκυλίω	Aristophanes, Polyaeus of Macedonia (II CE).	πρός + κυλίω Prov 26,27
προσορμίζω	Aristotle, Demosthenes, Philo.	πρός + ὄρμος Gen 49,13
πυρέσσω	Plato, Aristotle, Josephus.	πυρετός Deut 28,22
πώρωσις	Hippocrates, Galen.	πωρόω Job 17,7
σκύλλω	Aristotle, Xenophon, Herodianus (II CE). P.Oxy 2.295 (35 CE).	σκυλμός 3Macc 4,6
σταυρός (4×)	Herodotus, Xenophon, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch.	σταυρώω Esth 7,9
συζητέω (6×)	Plato, Epictetus. P.Oxy 1673.20 (II CE).	σύν + ζητέω Gen 19,11

LEMMA	ATESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
σμπνίγω (2×)	Theophrastus, Aristophanes.	σύν + πνίγω 1Sam 16,15
σχίσμα	Aristotle, Theophrastus, Rufus (II CE). P.Giss.Univ 4 44 (200 BCE).	σχίζω Gen 22,3
σωφρονέω	Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, Herodotus, Josephus, Philo.	σώφρων 4Macc 15,10
τελώνης (3×)	Aristotle, Josephus, Plutarch. BGU 6 1259 (100 BCE).	τέλος Gen 46,4
τελώνιον	Posidippus, Strabo. BGU 4 1118 (22 BCE).	τέλος Gen 46,4
θυγάτριον (2×)	Menander, Aristophanes, Epictetus, Demosthenes, Plutarch, Josephus, Xenarch.	dim. θυγάτηρ Gen 5,4
ιχθύδιον	Aristophanes, Chrysippus, Strabo, Plutarch. Lucianus Sophist (II CE). O.Claud. 02, P.Oxy 784 (I BCE).	dim. ιχθύς Gen 1,26
κυνάριον (2×)	Plato, Xenophon, Epictetus.	dim. κύων Exod 11,7
ᾠτάριον	Anaxandrides (IV BCE), Athenaus. P.Ifao 3.37 (136 BCE), ID 384 (196 BCE), ID 421.54 (II BCE).	dim. οὖς Gen 20,8
πλοιάριον	Xenophon, Aristophanes, Strabo. P.Cair.Zen 2.59217 (254 BCE). Menander (III BCE), Pollux (II CE).	dim. πλοῖον Gen 49,13
κράβαττον (5×)	Rhinthon, Crito (Pollux), Epictetus. WL [κράβαττος P.Lond 2.191 (117 CE)].	root not in LXX
ἄγγαρεύω	Menander, Josephus. WL. Chr.Wilck 439 (42 CE).	root not in LXX
ἀδημονέω	Plato, Xenophon, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch.	root not in LXX
ἄρτω	Homer, Aristotle, Polybius, Josephus, Philo.	root not in LXX
ἄφρίζω (2×)	Sophocles, Plutarch.	root not in LXX
γαλήνη	Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Josephus, Philo [γαλήνός in Polybius].	root not in LXX
κερδαίνω	Aristotle, Plato, Xenophon, Polybius, Josephus, Philo.	root not in LXX
κολλυβιστής	Menander, Lysias [κολλυβιστήριον P.Teb. 485 (II BCE)]	root not in LXX
κυλλός	Hippocrates, Aristophanes.	root not in LXX
πίναξ (2×)	Aristotle, Plato, Herodotus, Polybius.	root not in LXX
πρύμνα	Homer, Aristotle, Polybius, Philo, Plutarch.	root not in LXX

LEMMA	ATESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
σίναιπι	Anaxíppus. P.Tebt 1.913 (III BCE), root not in LXX P.Oxy 920.2 (II CE).	
σπόγγος	Homer, Plato, Philo. PSI 535.20 root not in LXX (III BCE).	
σπυρίς (2x)	Aristophanes, Athenaeus, Epictetus, root not in LXX Philo. P.Iand.Zen 53 (257 BCE).	
στιβάς	Herodotus, Xenophon, Polybius, Philo. root not in LXX	
τρίζω	Herodotus, Isocrates. Aristotle, Phi- root not in LXX lostratus [τρίσω Isa 38,14 Sym; τρι- ζήσω Amos 2,13 Aq].	
χοῖρος (4x)	Plato, Homer, Xenophon, Plutarch. [ῥς root not in LXX Lev 11,7 LXX].	
POST-CLASSICAL WORDS		
ἀρχισυνάγωγος (4x)	Lk. Dionysius of Hal. SEG 8.170, ἀρχή + συναγωγή Exod 12,47 SEG 20.442.	
ἀφεδρών	Mt [ἄφεδρος Lev 12,2]. WL: BL 12. ἀπό + ἔδρα Deut 28,27 Dioscorides Pharmacologist (I CE), Galen (II CE). SEG 13.521.233 (II BCE).	
βάπτισμα (4x)	Mt, Lk, Rom. Procopius (VI CE).	βαπτίζω 2Kgs 5,14
βαπτισμός	Col, Heb. Josephus.	βαπτίζω 2Kgs 5,14
βαπτιστής (2x)	Mt, Lk. Josephus.	βαπτίζω 2Kgs 5,14
γαμίζω	Mt, Lk, 1Cor. Apollonius Dyscolus γάμος Tob 11,19 (II CE).	
διαφημίζω	Mt. Dionysius of Hal., Josephus.	διά + φημίζω Gen 24,47
ἐκπερισσῶς	Mk.	ἐκ + περισσῶς 2Macc 8,27
ἐνταφιασμός	Jn [ἐνταφιάζω in Philodemus of ἐνταφιάζω Gen 5,2 Gadara (I BCE) and Plutarch].	
ἐξαυτῆς	Acts, Phil. Aratus (III BCE), Polybius, ἐξ + αὐτῆς Diodorus Siculus. WL	
ἐπισυντρέχω	Mk.	ἐπί + σύν + τρέχω Gen 18,7
εὐκαιρέω	Acts, 1Cor. Polybius, Josephus, εὖ + καιρός Gen 6,13 + Plutarch, Philo. P.Cair.Zen 3 59365 1Macc 11,42 (242 BCE).	
κάκειθεν	Josephus. PSI 4 406 (260 BCE), BGU 8 crasis for καί + ἐκεῖθεν 1768 (64 BCE). Gen 2,10	
κατεξουσιάζω	Mt [κατεξουσία IG 14.1047.5].	κατά + ἐξουσιάζω Qoh 2,19
καυματίζω	Mt, Rev. Epictetus, Plutarch. WL.	καῶμα Gen 8,22
κεφαλίω	Mk [κεφαλαίω in Plato, Aristotle, κεφαλαίω Sir 32,8; Xenophon]. κεφαλῇ Gen 3,15	

LEMMA	ATESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
κωμόπολις	Strabo.	κώμη + πόλις 2Macc 14,16 + Gen 10,12
μεταμορφόω	Mt, Rom, 2Cor. Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus.	μετά + μορφόω μορφή Judg 8,18
οικοδεσπότης	Mt, Lk. Alexis, Plutarch, Josephus, Epictetus.	οἶκος + δεσπότης Gen 7,1 + Gen 15,2
ὀνικός	Mt. P.Col.Zen 2.107.4 (III BCE).	ὄνος Exod 21,33
παιδιόθεν	Mk [Gen 47.3 in Codex Alexandrinus: εκ παιδιοθεν εως του νυν]. Hapax in Bible. P.Lond 5 1731 (585 CE).	παιδίον Gen 17,12
παραλυτικός (5x)	Mt. Rufus, Dioscorides Pharmacologist [παράλυσις and παραλύω in Polybius]. P.TM 63131.	παραλύω Gen 4,15
προμεριμνάω	Mk.	πρό + μεριμνάω Exod 5,9
πρωτοκαθεδρία	Lk.	πρῶτος + καθέδρα 1Sam 20,18
πρωτοκλισία	Mt, Lk. SB 6 8993 (175 BCE), ID 1520.33 (153 BCE) [πρωτοκλίσιον 2Macc 4,21].	πρῶτος + κλισία 3Macc 6,31
συμρνίζω	Dioscorides Pharmacologist.	σύν + ρνίζω Exod 30,23
στασιαστής	Josephus, Dionysius of Hal. P.Cair. Zen 3 (226 BCE).	στασιάζω 2Macc 4,30
συσπάρσσω	Lk. Maximus of Tyre Sophist (II CE).	σύν + σπάρσσω 2Sam 22,8
συσταυρώω	Mt, Jn, Rom [σταυρώω, “to crucify” in Polybius].	σύν + σταυρώω Esth 7,9
ὑπερπερισσῶς	Mk.	ὑπέρ + περισσῶς 2Macc 8,27
ὑστέρησις	Phil.	ὑστέρω Sir 7,34
ψευδόχριστος	Mt.	ψευδής + χριστός Lev 4,5
ἄγναφος	Mt. P.Cair.Zen 92.16 (III BCE).	root not in LXX
οὐά	Epictetus, Dio Cassius.	root not in LXX
κολαφίζω	Mt, 1Cor, 1Pet. <i>Testaments of the XII Patriarchs</i> .	root not in LXX
ψιχίον	Mt [ψιχία plural in Archigenes (II CE); ψίξ in Plutarch].	dim. ψίξ root not in LXX
αββα	Gal, Rom.	Aramaic
βοανηργές	Mk.	Aramaic
γένενα (3x)	Mt, Lk, Jas.	Aramaic. 2Kgs 23,10
ἐφφαθά	Mk.	Aramaic
κουμ	Mk.	Aramaic

LEMMA	ATESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
κορβᾶν	Mk. [κορβανᾶς in Inscription Jebel Hallet Et-Tûri, Mt, and Josephus].	Aramaic. Lev 2,1
λεμα	Mt.	Aramaic. Ps 22,1
ῥαββί (3×)	Mt, Jn. [CIIJ 2.1.210 (before 70 CE)].	Aramaic
ῥαββουνεΐ	Jn. [TADAE B4.3.11].	Aramaic. Dan 4,33
σαβαχθανι	Mt.	Aramaic. Ps 22,1
ταλιθα	Mk.	Aramaic
ῶσαννά (2×)	Mt, Jn.	Aramaic. Ps 118,25
δηνάριον (3×)	Mt, Lk, Jn, Rev. Epictetus, Plutarch. ChLa 43 1241 (I BCE). CIIP 1/2 1102. CIG 4451.	Latin
κεντυρίων (3×)	Polybius. M 1392, IOGIS 196.9 (I BCE). P.Oslo 2 26.23 (I BCE). SB 5 8427.9 (I BCE).	Latin
κῆνσος	Mt. ABSA 12.178 (I BCE). IGRom. 4.1213 (II CE). Papyri. CPR 5 4 R (237 CE).	Latin
κοδράντης	Mt. SEG 55.821. IC 2 11.3.	Latin
λεγιών (2×)	Mt, Lk [λεγεών in Plutarch]. BGU 4 1104.34 (I CE), P.Oxy 2 276.9 (I CE), I.Ephesos 243.6 (I CE).	Latin
μόδιος	Mt, Lk. Polybius, Epictetus, Plutarch. WL. OGIS 533.30 (I BCE).	Latin
ξέστης	Epictetus, Josephus. BGU 16 2669 (5 BCE). IG 7.3498.54 (I BCE).	Latin
πραιτώριον	Jn. P.Oxy 58.3917 (125 CE). SIG 880.63 (202 CE). Procopius, Pseudo-Arrianus.	Latin
σπεκουλάτωρ	P.Mich. 8.469.22 (125 CE). BuEp 1959.260 (II-III CE).	Latin
φραγελλόω	Mk [φλαγέλλιον in John, P.Lond. 2.191.11 (110 CE)].	Latin

2. Words not appearing in the LXX

Which are the 128 Markan words not appearing in the LXX? What do they reflect? Can they provide us with valuable information to understand the Gospel better? In order to analyse these words, they can be grouped into several sets.

First, of the 128 lemmas that do not appear in the LXX, 85 lemmas are derived or composed from lemmas which do appear in the LXX, as can be checked in Table 1⁴¹, while 43 are clearly not derived or composed from words appearing in the LXX⁴². In fact, these 85 lemmas have meanings close to their roots and could very easily be recognised by the discursive community⁴³ receiving the Gospel. These words are transparent because a Greek native speaker could readily recognize the constituent morphemes. In fact Greek is a rather synthetic language and relatively transparent⁴⁴. Of the 128 lemmas not appearing in the LXX, ten belong to only six roots⁴⁵ and κἀκεῖθεν is a crasis of an expression appearing in the LXX. Moreover, the roots of the diminutives⁴⁶ found in Mark also appear in the LXX (with the exception of ψίξ). Several of these diminutives (forms ending with -ιον) had lost their diminutive meaning and replaced the corresponding base nouns⁴⁷. All these considerations effectively reduce the original 128 lemmas not appearing in the LXX to as few as 43, most of which are Latin (10) or Aramaic words (12).

Second, 26 of the 128 lemmas not appearing in the LXX are only found in Mark or the NT (*hapax legomena*), most of them being Latin (2) or Aramaic words (12). These *hapax legomena* are very few indeed⁴⁸,

⁴¹ The following formations are extremely productive: verbs ending in -ίζω, -αζω, -εω, -οω, -εω and nouns ended in -ιον, -μος, -μα, -της, -σις, -ισσα. S. COLVIN, *A Historical Greek Reader. Mycenaean to the Koiné* (Oxford 2007) 68.

⁴² The following are words whose roots do not appear in the LXX (except the Latin and Aramaic words): 7 verbs, 2 adjectives, 1 interjection and 13 nouns. Verbs: ἀγγαρεύω, ἀδημονέω, ἀρτώ, ἀφρίζω, κερδαίνω, κολαφίζω, τρίζω. Adjectives: κυλλός, ἄγναφος. Interjection: οὐά. Nouns: γαλήνη, τελώνης, τελώνιον, πίναξ, σπυρίς, κολλυβιστής, πρύμνα, πόρωσις, σίναπι, σπόγγος, στιβάς, χοῖρος, ψιχίον.

⁴³ A discourse community is a group of people who share a set of discourses, understood as basic values and assumptions, and ways of communicating about those goals. They are groups that have goals or purposes, and use communication to achieve these goals. J. SWALES, *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings* (Cambridge 1990) 21-32.

⁴⁴ M. SILVA, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning. An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids, MI²1994) 49.

⁴⁵ τελώνης and τελώνιον; ἐκπερισσῶς and ὑπερπερισσῶς; ἀποδημέω and ἀπόδημος; βάπτισμα, βαπτιστής, βαπτισμός and ἐμβάπτω.

⁴⁶ Diminutives in Mark [6, but 5 in LXX]: θυγάτριον dim. θυγάτηρ, daughter; ἰχθυδίων dim. ἰχθύς, fish; κυνάριον dim. κύων, dog; ψιχίον dim. ψίξ, crumb; ὠτάριον dim. οὖς, ear; πλοιάριον dim. πλοῖον, boat. All of these words appear in the LXX except ψίξ. Several of them could have lost their meaning as diminutives. Other diminutives appearing in Mark but also in LXX: κοράσιον dim. κόρη, girl (Esth 2,7; Tob 6,12); παιδίον dim. παῖς, child (Gen 17,12); σανδάλιον dim. σάνδαλον, sandal (Isa 20,2). J.J.K. ELLIOTT, "Nouns with Diminutive Endings in the New Testament", *NovT* 12 (1970) 391-398. J.M. WATT, "Diminutive Suffixes in the Greek New Testament: A Cross-Linguistic Study", *Biblical Ancient Greek Linguistics* 2 (2014) 29-74.

⁴⁷ S. TORALLAS TOVAR, "Koine, Features of", *EAGLL*, vol. 2 (ed. G. GIANNAKIS) (Leiden 2014) 273-277, here 276.

⁴⁸ See SWETE, *Mark*, xlv, and HEAD, "Mark's Vocabulary", 95-100.

and their roots appear both in the Septuagint or in other texts. The Latin and Aramaic loanwords found in the Gospel deserve further comment. Their presence reflects a language contact situation. They have been used more extensively than in other texts of antiquity. According to Martin Hengel: “There is no document of antiquity like the Gospel of Mark with so much Aramaic and Hebrew present”⁴⁹. There are ten Latin loanwords (μόδιος, σπεκουλάτωρ, δηνάριον [3×], ξέστης, κῆνσος, φραγελλῶ, κεντυρίων [3×], κοδράντης, πραιτώριον, λεγιών [2×]), which is a considerable number for a text of the first century⁵⁰. Latin loanwords appearing in Mark were morphologically and syntactically adapted to the recipient language and had been generally accepted in Koine Greek when Mark wrote his Gospel. On the other hand, there are a few Aramaic loanwords⁵¹ in the Gospel (σάββατον, πάσχα, σατανᾶς), all of which appear in the LXX. The remaining eleven Aramaic words⁵² in the Gospel are cases of codeswitching and not loanwords⁵³. The functions of the Latin and Aramaic loanwords are different. The Latin loanwords are not translated, implying that the receiving community could understand them; in fact, two Latin words are used to translate two Greek words (κοδράντης and πραιτώριον). In contrast, the Aramaic switches of code are translated into Greek and have a particular significance in the Gospel, being used as literary devices: Jesus’ words when performing miracles (ταλιθα κουμ, εφφαθα); ἁμήν (14×) acting as a discourse marker; the people’s acclamation when Jesus entered Jerusalem (ὥσαννά); Jesus’ last words on the cross (Ελωι Ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι); the word Jesus used when talking with God (αββα); and the title by which Jesus’ disciples addressed him (ῥαββί 3×).

Third, 70 lemmas (54%) of the 128 lemmas of Mark not appearing in the LXX are attested before Aristotle and in the Hellenistic period. This reflects the fact that Mark uses the normal vocabulary of his time, which for the most part goes back before Aristotle. In fact, Markan words coming from the LXX such as ἄγγελος (Mark 1,2), ἄγρός (Mark 5,14), σῖτος

⁴⁹ M. HENGEL, “Probleme des Markusevangeliums”, *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*. Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982 (ed. P. STUHLMACHER) (WUNT 28; Tübingen 1983) 221-265, here 243.

⁵⁰ E. DICKEY, “Latin Influence on the Greek of Documentary Papyri: An Analysis of its Chronological Distribution”, *ZPE* 15 (2003) 249-257.

⁵¹ They would surely be part of the vocabulary of that discursive community.

⁵² Aramaic loanwords and expressions (12): βοανηργές, ταλιθα κουμ, εφφαθα, ῥαββί (3×), ῥαββουνεϊ, κορβᾶν, ὥσαννά (2×), γέεννα, αββα, λεμα σαβαχθανι, ἁμήν (14×, 1Chr 16,36; Tob 8,8), προσάββατον (Jdt 8,6; Ps 92,1), σάββατον (Exod 16,23), πάσχα (3×, Exod 12,21), Ελωι (Judg 5,5), σατάν (1Kgs 11,14), and σατανᾶς (Sir 21,27).

⁵³ Their functions have been analysed in A. DELGADO GÓMEZ, “‘Get up! Be opened!’: Codeswitching and Loanwords in the Gospel of Mark”, *JSNT* 42 (2020) 1-38.

(Mark 4,28) and τέκτων (Mark 6,6) are found in the oldest written form of Greek, Mycenaean Greek (the Linear B tablets, XV-XII BCE), and are still used today in Greece, after 3,500 years ⁵⁴.

Fourth, the remaining 32 lemmas are only attested in post-Classical authors such as Epictetus, Polybius, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch, etc., and in papyri or inscriptions. They reflect the normal evolution of the language, which builds new words constantly. Actually, the greater part of the Greek vocabulary consists of words that are in one way or another the product of word formation. Few words, in fact, consist of just a root ⁵⁵.

Fifth, 105 of these 128 words only appear once in Mark. Of the remaining words not appearing in the LXX (excluding the Latin loanwords), the following can be underlined: μαθητής ⁵⁶ (46×), διακονέω ⁵⁷ (5×) and βάπτισμα (4×, found only in Christian writers), which are important to Mark's theology, and συζητέω (6×) which appears in Classical texts. Other words are used to refer to new concepts that emerged at that time: τελώνης (3×) and τελώνιον, σταυρός (4×) and συσταυρόω (although σταυρόω appears in LXX), δαιμονίζομαι (coming from the Hellenistic worldview), ἀρχισυνάγωγος (4×), κράβαττος (5×) which Matthew and Luke replaced with κλίνη. χοῖρος substitutes for ὕξ which is used in LXX. γαμίζω appears in Mark, while in LXX συνοικέω (15×) and γαμέω (Esth 10,3; 2Macc 14,25) are used.

Table 2 – Lemmas in the LXX

<i>Lemmas in LXX: 1,113</i>		<i>Lemmas not in LXX: 128</i>		
<i>Canon LXX</i>	<i>Apocry LXX</i>	<i>Classical + Hellen</i>	<i>Post-Classical</i>	<i>Mark / NT</i>
1,065	48	70	32	26

In conclusion, Mark's vocabulary is very closely (90%) related to the books of the LXX. Moreover, as demonstrated above, the number not related to the LXX could be reduced to only 43 lemmas not appearing in

⁵⁴ C.C. CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* (WUNT 167; Tübingen 2004) 25-26.

⁵⁵ E. VAN EMDE BOAS – A. RIJKSBARON – L. HUITINK, et al., *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* (Cambridge 2019) 261.

⁵⁶ The noun תַּלְמִיד (disciple), which later in rabbinic linguistic usage plays a great role, in the Hebrew OT is found only in 1Chr 25,8 translated in LXX as μανθανόντων. The companion of Moses (Exod 24,13) or of the prophets is not called a disciple, but a תַּשְׁבֵּחַ (servant), translated as λειτουργός. Elisha is Elijah's servant (ὁ λειτουργός Ελισαιε, 2Kgs 6,15). To refer to the servant or disciple the LXX uses ὑπουργός (1×), δοῦλος, λειτουργῶν (8×) and λειτουργούς (2×), θεράπων (10×), παῖς, ὑπηρέτης.

⁵⁷ The verbs used in LXX to refer to this concept are λατρεύω (2Chr 7,19), λειτουργέω (2Chr 8,14) and δουλεύω (1Kgs 16,31).

the LXX, which would increase the percentage related to the LXX to 96.5%. The non-LXX vocabulary reflects the contact language situation with Latin and Aramaic (22) and the normal evolution of the language (33).

IV. COMPARISON WITH OTHER WORKS

In order to understand and evaluate the large presence of LXX’s words in Mark’s Gospel, in this section a comparison will be made between the vocabulary of the Septuagint and that of other Greek works. Table 3 compares the number of lemmas (roots) found in several texts written in Koine Greek in a Jewish register to the LXX’s lemmas. The term “token” refers to the total number of words in a text regardless of how often they are repeated, and the term “type” refers to the number of distinct words in a text.

Table 3 – Comparison of lemmas from different Jewish books to the LXX

	<i>Tokens</i>	<i>Total Lemmas</i>	<i>Lemmas not in LXX</i>	<i>%Lemmas not in LXX</i>
LXX	605,276	13,607		
Mark’s Gospel	11,133	1,315	128	10.02%
Paul’s authentic letters	24,093	2,071	274	13.23%
Joseph and Asenet	8,224	1,403	40	2.85%
Josephus, <i>Antiquities</i>	312,072	11,500	6,218	54.07%
Josephus’ Works	473,671	14,198	8,370	58.95%
Philo’s Works	437,490	12,725	7,232	56.83%

All of these works listed in Table 3 are written in Koine Greek during the first century CE. While composed in different styles, they all belong to the Jewish-Hellenistic register. The vocabularies of Josephus and Philo are much broader than that of the other works, and it can be appreciated how distinct are their vocabularies from the LXX. On the one hand, the vocabularies of *Joseph and Aseneth*, Mark and Paul are very close to the LXX. On the other hand, Philo and Josephus are clearly distinct from the LXX’s vocabulary, reflecting what we know of its Attic and high style. However, this difference is surprising because a greater closeness could be expected given the large number of lemmas in Philo and Josephus.

Table 4 compares the number of types and tokens of several works with the vocabulary of the LXX. *Agésilas* and *Evagoras* were written in Attic

or Classical Greek (IV BCE) and have been chosen because they are labelled as “ancient biographies” and have been taken as “genre models” for Mark’s Gospel by several authors. Among the works which show a Jewish register stand the works of Mark, Paul, and *Joseph and Aseneth* which were written in Koine Greek close to a low style, while Josephus, Philo, and Polybius are exponents of the Koine Greek that imitates Classical Greek ⁵⁸. Epictetus’ *Discourses* are the prime example of the literary texts which have many points of contact linguistically with the NT ⁵⁹, and they have been labelled “as the closest thing we have to a representation of the educated spoken language of the second century CE” ⁶⁰. Epictetus’ language and the language of the NT are “a reasonably close reflection of the everyday Greek of the majority of the literate population in the early centuries CE, subject, as always, to the influence of the ordinary written language of business and administration learned in school” ⁶¹. Philostratus’ *Apollonius*, written in the second century CE, is an exponent of the second sophistic, favoring Atticism and Classicism, and is related to the ancient biographical genre.

Table 4 – Comparison of words in Classical and Jewish authors with those in the LXX

	<i>Tokens</i>	<i>Types</i>	<i>Tokens not in LXX</i>	<i>Types not in LXX</i>	<i>% Tokens not in LXX</i>	<i>% Types not in LXX</i>
LXX	605,276	43,779				
Mark’s Gospel	11,133	2,806	1,116	819	10.02%	29.19%
Paul’s authentic letters	24,093	4,920	2,676	1,945	11.11%	39.53%
<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	8,224	1,930	656	375	7.98%	19.43%
Josephus, <i>Antiquities</i>	312,072	41,345	61,337	29,424	19.65%	71.17%
Josephus’ Works	473,671	55,557	96,205	41,588	20.31%	74.86%
Philo’s Works	437,490	55,658	98,567	42,371	22.53%	76.13%
Polybius’ <i>Histories</i>	299,313	37,514	68,620	28,402	22.93%	75.71%
Epictetus’ <i>Discourses</i>	74,992	14,756	14,350	9,144	19.14%	61.97%

⁵⁸ The variety of written Koine Greek ranged from everyday documents written by civil servants to high literature by writers consciously emulating Classical models (Polybius, Strabo, and Plutarch), and the relatively unsophisticated Greek of the New Testament. The highest written register, the standard language (the Classical Attic of the fifth century BCE represented e.g. in Demosthenes), and the lowest spoken registers form the poles of a continuum.

⁵⁹ R. BROWNING, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (London 1969) 23.

⁶⁰ G.C. HORROCKS, *Greek. A History of the Language and Its Speakers* (Oxford 2010) 146.

⁶¹ HORROCKS, *Greek*, 147.

	<i>Tokens</i>	<i>Types</i>	<i>Tokens not in LXX</i>	<i>Types not in LXX</i>	<i>% Tokens not in LXX</i>	<i>% Types not in LXX</i>
Xenophon's <i>Agesilaus</i>	7,378	2,733	1,657	1,279	22.46%	46.80%
Isocrates' <i>Evagoras</i>	4,598	1,750	1,009	760	21.94%	43.43%
Philostratus' <i>Apolloni</i>	82,100	19,202	23,760	13,814	28.94%	71.94%

As has already been stated, Mark uses 1,315 lemmas out of 11,133 words. On the most conservative estimate, only 128 words do not appear in the LXX, representing 9.73% of the total lemmas. Of the works analysed, Mark's Gospel has the second highest coincidence of vocabulary with that of the LXX.

An analysis of *Joseph and Aseneth* shows unexpected results. It was written in Greek ⁶², using 8,224 words (tokens) from 1,042 lemmas including proper and place names, and contains only 40 lemmas that do not appear in the LXX. It is the work with the highest percentage of Septuagintal vocabulary (97.15%). *Joseph and Aseneth* is characterized by the paratactic style and makes use of expressions and complete sentences from the LXX (e.g. καὶ ἐγένετο and καὶ ἰδοὺ) as well as multiple quotations from the Psalms, Genesis, Exodus and Isaiah. There are in total 260 references from the LXX ⁶³.

Paul's authentic letters ⁶⁴ contain a significant presence of Septuagintal vocabulary (86.77% and only 274 lemmas not in the LXX ⁶⁵) and biblical quotations. My analysis cannot corroborate Riddle's statistics which are as follows: "The non-Septuagint element in the vocabulary of the Markan Gospel is 5.7%, and of Paul the average is 6.92%".

Philo and Josephus, who wrote in Koine Greek and in a Jewish register, use a wider vocabulary than Mark (76.13% and 74.86% respectively), and their syntax is more complex than Mark's ⁶⁶. Josephus follows Polybius' style, whereas Philo follows the style of Plato. The Septuagint also influenced Josephus and Philo but did not affect their syntax, which was close the Atticistic Greek of the first century. It is particularly striking that

⁶² E.M. HUMPHREY, *Joseph and Aseneth* (Sheffield 2000) 31.

⁶³ M. PHILONENKO, *Joseph et Aséneth*. Introduction, Texte critique, Traduction, et Notes (Leiden 1968) 31. G. DELLING, "Einwirkungen der Sprache der Septuaginta in 'Joseph und Aseneth'", *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 9 (1978) 29-56, here 56.

⁶⁴ D.W. RIDDLE, "The Non-Septuagint Element in the Vocabulary of Paul", *JBL* 47 (1928) 74-90, here 83.

⁶⁵ The number of proper names in the authentic letters is 114 according to my calculation.

⁶⁶ According to my calculations, Mark and Philo have 76% of common lemmas while Josephus and Mark 80%. K. FUGLSETH, "Common Words in the New Testament and Philo: Some Results from a Complete Vocabulary Comparison", *Neotestamentica et Philonica*. Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen (eds. P. BORGES – D.E. AUNE – T. SELAND – J.H. ULRICHSEN) (Leiden 2003) 393-414.

Josephus, who in his *Antiquities* is telling a similar narrative as in the books of the LXX ⁶⁷, has a greatly improved syntax, style and vocabulary compared with that of the LXX, as is reflected in the above statistics.

Polybius, the greatest exponent of the literary high level of Koine Greek ⁶⁸, also uses a different vocabulary, very distant from the LXX (75.71%). Only 23 words (of 300,000) appearing in Polybius are Latin loanwords, but according to Dubuisson only *πατρίκιος* is a received and integrated loanword in Polybius ⁶⁹.

The statistics from Epictetus' *Discourses* are very significant, because, while sharing a close relationship with Mark in terms of language variety, his vocabulary is far from the LXX (61.97%).

Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and Isocrates' *Evagoras*, two works written in Attic Greek several centuries earlier, show, as would be expected, a greater distance from the vocabulary of the Koine Greek of the LXX (46.8% and 43.43% respectively). Philostratus' *Apollonius*, a clear exponent of the Classicism of the second century CE, also shows a clear distance from the LXX's vocabulary (71.94%).

In sum, Mark's vocabulary is very close to the LXX's vocabulary, and it must be understood as a conscious and personal choice of the author. The coincidence with Paul and *Joseph and Aseneth* in the ratio of words shared with the LXX corroborates this assertion.

V. MARK AND THE GREEK VOCABULARY OF ITS TIME

Once Mark's vocabulary has been compared with a corpus as limited as the LXX, it may be interesting to wonder about the relationship of Mark's vocabulary with the snapshot of the Greek vocabulary available to him in the first century CE, insofar as we can access it in other literary texts, inscriptions and papyri (both literary and documentary). This vocabulary of the first century would be the accumulation of words from other periods (e.g. the Classical period), while adding new words coming from derivation, compounding and borrowing, and removing the words not in use or forgotten (for example, from other dialects).

Although the vocabulary of the Gospel of Mark is essentially the vocabulary of its time, it only represents a very limited part of the language in

⁶⁷ Josephus claims to offer a completely accurate rendering of the Bible in Greek. T. RAJAK, "Josephus and the Septuagint", *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint* (eds. A. SALVESEN – T.M. LAW) (Oxford 2021) 421-433, here 424.

⁶⁸ HORROCKS, *Greek*, 96.

⁶⁹ M. DUBUISSON, *Le latin de Polybe*. Les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme (Paris 1985) 55.

general use. Thus, the GE dictionary contains 132,884 entries of Greek words ⁷⁰ and LSJ 116,500, of which Mark uses only 1,315 lemmas. Also the LXX represents a very limited range of words, around 43,700 lemmas.

In this sense, it must be stressed that, although the vocabulary of the Gospel has a significant congruence with that of the LXX, the New Testament and the Septuagint do not constitute a homogeneous corpus from a lexicological point of view ⁷¹. The books of the Septuagint were perceived as part of a canon and belonged to the Jewish and Jewish-Christian discursive communities, but these books display a small number of registers and literary genres. They show a very limited part of the Greek lexicon of the third and second centuries BCE.

The vocabulary of the Septuagint is not identified with the vocabulary of a discursive community. It could simply represent part of the religious, narrative, poetical and historical registers of the Greek vocabulary of the Jewish community. In fact the Greek of the LXX is a peculiar Greek, a translation Greek, the aftermath of a literary achievement. Moreover, the Greek Jews of Alexandria belonged to several discursive communities, because they were part of the normal life of their city. In this sense, Philo's texts could represent part of the Jewish vocabulary related to the philosophical register of this community.

All of this leads us to wonder about the nature of Mark's vocabulary. What is it made of? Does Mark's vocabulary reflect an accurate snapshot of the vocabulary of his time or is it an anachronistic language due to its relationship with the LXX? It is important to underline that no one in the first century CE used phrases like καὶ ἐγένετο, which would sound strange to someone who did not know the texts of the LXX ⁷². In this sense, we assume that Mark wrote a text that was intended to be understood by his discursive community, and his translations of the Aramaic sentences into Greek reflect this aim. Furthermore, his text was well understood and spurred the interest of Matthew and Luke, who, while improving his syntax, respected Mark's vocabulary, given that 82% of Matthew's vocabulary and 81% of Luke's is shared with Mark.

As verified below in table 5, the result of comparing Mark's vocabulary with the corpus of Greek texts before Aristotle shows that 90.33% (1,129 lemmas) of Mark's vocabulary occurs in Classical or pre-Aristotelian Greek. Only 119 lemmas are not found in authors before Aristotle. This confirms and adds weight to the conclusions of the earlier studies of

⁷⁰ MONTANARI, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, vii.

⁷¹ WEIGER, "Le Vocabulaire", 450.

⁷² καὶ ἐγένετο appears 21× in Philo and 3× in Josephus. καὶ εὐθύς is not attested in Josephus, but 9× in Philo.

Thayer, Kennedy, Potwin and Morgenthaler ⁷³. According to my calculations, Kennedy, basing his findings on Grimm's lists, asserted that 80% of all of the vocabulary of the NT dated from before 322 BCE ⁷⁴, while Potwin ⁷⁵ proposed a percentage of 83.76%. This present analysis corrects these findings.

These 119 post-Classical lemmas, which comprise 9.04% of the Markan vocabulary, appear in the LXX, Polybius, Epictetus, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch, etc., as well as in papyri and inscriptions. They would not have appeared strange to the reader, because they belonged to the normal vocabulary of their time. The presence of these new words reflects the normal changes in the Koine language during the three centuries between the translation of the books of the LXX and the final redaction of Mark's Gospel. According to Browning, "[t]he Koine Greek did not remain static but was in process of continuous development. There were no doubt also local differences within it" ⁷⁶.

These post-Classical words were derived or compounded from words belonging to the Classical period, which could easily be recognized ⁷⁷. As Potwin states in his analysis of NT post-Classical words, "[t]hey are, with very few exceptions, derivatives or compounds, and from roots found in the Greek classics" ⁷⁸. The words and their roots, as well as their relationship with the LXX are set out in Table 5.

Table 5 – 119 Words not in Classical authors ⁷⁹

LEMMAS NOT IN LXX	ATTESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
βοανηγρέζ	Mk.	Aramaic
ἐκπερισσῶς	Mk.	περισσῶς Ps 30,24
ἐπισυντρέχω	Mk [ἐπιτρέχω in P.Fay 107.7].	ἐπί + σύν + τρέχω Gen 18,7

⁷³ L.S. POTWIN, "The New Testament Vocabulary. III. Native Words not Found in Classical Authors", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 37:147 (1880) 503-527. L.S. POTWIN, "The New Testament Vocabulary", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 37:148 (1880) 640-660. THAYER – GRIMM – WILKE, *Lexicon*, 691-699. MORGENTHALER, *Statistik*, 175-176.

⁷⁴ KENNEDY, *Sources*, 62 and 134.

⁷⁵ POTWIN, "The New Testament Vocabulary", 653.

⁷⁶ BROWNING, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 23.

⁷⁷ All this mass of new words we have seen to be derived from the words of the Classical period. They were not obscure in origin. POTWIN, "The New Testament Vocabulary", 658.

⁷⁸ POTWIN, "The New Testament Vocabulary", 653.

⁷⁹ The third column in this table signifies with an asterisk (*) the words identified as LXX neologisms in GELS, i.e., not attested before the LXX, but this identification was carried out following LSJ, and must be corrected (X).

LEMMAS NOT IN LXX	ATTESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
ἐφφαθά	Mk.	Aramaic
κουμ	Mk.	Aramaic
προμεριμνάω	Mk.	μεριμνάω Exod 5,9
ταλιθα	Mk.	Aramaic
ὑπερπερισσῶς	Mk.	περισσῶς Ps 30,24
κεφαλαιῶ	Mk [κεφαλαῖῶ in Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon].	κεφαλαῖῶ Sir 32,8
παιδιόθεν	Mk [Gen 47,3 in Codex A; P. Lond 5 1731 (585 CE)].	παῖς Gen 9,25
αββα	Rom, Gal.	Aramaic
γένενα (3x)	Mt, Lk.	Aramaic. 2Kgs 23,30
ἐνταφιασμός	Jn.	ἐνταφιάζω Gen 50,2
κατεξουσιάζω	Mt.	κατά + ἐξουσιάζω Qoh 2,19
λεμα	Mt.	Aramaic. Ps 22,1
πρωτοκαθεδρία	Mt, Lk.	καθέδρα Ps 1,1
ῥαββί (3x)	Mt, Jn [CII 2.1.210 (before 70 CE)].	Aramaic
ῥαββουνεῖ	Jn [TADAE B4.3.11].	Aramaic. Dan 4,33
σαβαχθανι	Mt.	Aramaic. Ps 22,1
συσταυρόω	Mt, Jn, Rom, Gal [σταυρόω, “to crucify”, in Polybius].	σταυρόω Esth 7,9
ὑστέρησις	Phil [ὑστέρημα in Judg 18,10].	ὑστερέω Num 9,7
φραγελλῶ	Mt [φλαγέλλιον in P.Lond. 2.191.11 (110 CE) and Jn].	Latin
ψευδόχριστος	Mt.	ψευδής + χριστός Lev 4,5
ὡσαννά (2x)	Mt, Jn.	Aramaic. Ps 118,25
ἄγναφος	P.Cair.Zen 92.16 (III BCE).	root not in LXX
ἄφεδρών	WL, BL 12, SEG 13.521.233 (II BCE). Galen.	ἔδρα Deut 28,27
ἄρχισυνάγωγος	SEG 8.170, SEG 20 442.	συναγωγή Exod 12,47
βάπτισμα (4x)	[Procopius (VI CE)]	βαπτίζω 2Kgs 5,14

LEMMAS NOT IN LXX	ATTESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
βαπτισμός	Josephus.	βαπτίζω 2Kgs 5,14
βαπτιστής (2x)	Josephus.	βαπτίζω 2Kgs 5,14
γαμίζω	Apollonius Dyscolus (II CE).	γάμος Tob 11,19
δηνάριον (3x)	Epictetus, Plutarch. ChLa 43 1241 (I BCE), CIIP 1/2 1102, CIG 4451.	Latin
διαφημίζω	Dionysius of Hal., Josephus.	διά + φημίζω Gen 24,47
εὐκαιρέω	Polybius, Josephus, Plutarch, Philo, Demetrius, Zenon. PSI 4 374 (250 BCE), WL.	εὖ + καιρός Gen 6,13 + 1Macc 11,42
κάκειθεν	Josephus. PSI 4 406 (260 BCE), BGU 8 1768 (64 BCE).	crasis for καί + ἐκεῖθεν Gen 2,10
καυματίζω	Epictetus, Plutarch. WL.	καῦμα Gen 8,22
κεντυρίων (3x)	Polybius. M 1392, IOGIS 196.9 (I BCE), P.Oslo 2 26.23 (I BCE), SB 5 8427.9 (I BCE).	Latin
κῆνσος	ABSA 12.178 (I BCE), IGRom. 4.1213 (II CE), CPR 5 4 R (237 CE).	Latin
κοδράντης	SEG 55.821, IC 2 11.3.	Latin
κολαφίζω	<i>Testaments of the XII Patriarchs</i> , Mt, Paul, 1Pet.	root not in LXX
κορβᾶν	Mt, Josephus κορβανᾶς.	Aramaic
κωμόπολις	Strabo.	κώμη + πόλις 2Macc 14,16 + Gen 10,12
λεγιών (2x)	Plutarch λεγεών. BGU 4 1104.34 (I CE), P.Oxy 2 276.9 (I CE), I.Ephesos 243.6 (I CE). Mt, Lk.	Latin

<i>LEMMAS NOT IN LXX</i>	<i>ATTESTATION</i>	<i>ROOT IN LXX</i>
μεταμορφώ	Plutarch, Longinus, Diodorus Siculus.	μετά + μορφώ, μορφή Judg 8,18
μόδιος	Polybius, Epictetus, Plutarch. WL. OGIS 533.30 (I BCE). Mt, Lk.	Latin
νουνεχῶς	Polybius, Josephus, Plutarch.	νοῦς + ἔχω Isa 10,7
ξέστης	Epictetus, Josephus. BGU 16 2669 (5 BCE), IG 7.3498.54 (I BCE).	Latin
οἰκοδεσπότης	Epictetus, Josephus, Plutarch.	οἶκος + δεσπότης Gen 7,1 + Gen 15,2
ὄνικός	P.Col.Zen. 2 107 4 (III BCE).	ὄνος Gen 12,16
οὐά	Epictetus, Dio Cassius.	Interjection
παραλυτικός (5x)	Dioscorides Pharmacologist (I CE), Rufus medical writer, (II CE).	παραλύω Gen 4,15
πραιτώριον	P.Oxy 58.3917 (125 CE), SIG 880.63 (202 CE). Procopius, Pseudo-Arrianus. Jn.	Latin
πρωτοκλισία	SB 6 8993 (175 BCE), ID 1520.33 (153 BCE). πρωτοκλίσιον 2Macc 4,21.	πρῶτος + κλισία 3Macc 6,31
σπεκουλάτωρ	P.Mich. 8 469 22 (125 CE), BuEp 1959 260 (II-III CE).	Latin
σμυρνίζω	Dioscorides Pharmacologist	σμυρνίζω, σμύρνα Exod 30,23
στασιαστής	Josephus, Dionysius of Hal. P.Cair.Zen 3.59484.4 (226 BCE)	στασιάζω 2Macc 4,30
συσπαράσσω	Maximus of Tyre Sophist (II CE)	σύν + σπαράσσω 2Sam 22,8
ψιχίον	ψιχία plural in Archigenes (II CE)	dim. ψίξ

SEPTUAGINTAL WORDS	LXX	M	ATTESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
ἀθετέω (2×)	Exod 21,8	—	Sept. Epictetus, Polybius, Josephus, Plutarch.	ἀθετος, τίθημι
ἀκυρόω	1Esd 6,31	—	Sept. Josephus, Plutarch.	ἀ + κυρόω, κῦρος
ἀποκεφαλίζω (2×)	Ps 151,7	—	Sept. Atheneus, Arrianus (II CE), Epictetus.	ἀπό + κεφαλίζω
ἀποκυλίω (2×)	Gen 29,3	—	Sept. Diodorus Siculus, Lucian.	ἀπό + κυλίω
γαζοφυλάκιον	2Kgs 23,11	—	Sept. Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Strabo. OGI 225.16 (III BCE).	γάζα + φυλακή
διασκορπίζω	Num 10,35	—	Sept. Polybius, Josephus.	διά + σκορπίζω
ἐκθαμβέω (4×)	Sir 30,9	—	Sept. Polybius. Orph.A. 1218.	ἐκ + θαμβέω, θάμβος
ἐκθανμάζω	Sir 27,23	—	Sept. Dionysius of Hal., Josephus, Longinus.	ἐκ + θαυμάζω
ἐναγκαλίζομαι	Prov 6,10	—	Sept. Meleager (I BCE), Plutarch.	ἐν + αγκαλίζομαι, ἀναγκάζω ἀνάγκη
ἐνδιδύσκω	2Sam 1,24	*	Sept. Josephus. ἐνδυδισκόμενος SIG 2857.13.	ἐν + δύνω
ἐξάπινα	Lev 21,4	*	Sept. SB 7792, SEG 8.595, P.Giss 68.6 (II CE). ἐξάπινης Menander.	ἐξάπινης
ἐξομολογέω	Gen 29,36	—	Sept. Josephus, Strabo, Plutarch.	ἐξ + ὁμολογέω
ἐξουθενέω	2Kgs 19,21	*	Sept. ἐξουθενόω 1Sam 15,23. PSB 7524.8 (II BCE). ἐξουθενέω Josephus. ἐξουθενίζω Plutarch.	ἐξουθενίζω, ἐξ + οὐδεῖς
ἐπαύριον	Gen 19,34	—	Sept. Polybius.	ἐπί + αὔριον
ἐπίβλημα	Isa 3,22	—	Sept. Plutarch, Galen.	ἐπί + βλήμα, βάλλω
ἐπισυνάγω	Gen 6,16	—	Sept. Polybius, Josephus, Longinus.	ἐπί + συνάγω

SEPTUAGINTAL WORDS	LXX	M	ATTESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
ἐρήμωσις	Lev 26,34	–	Sept. Josephus, Euripides.	ἐρημος
εὐκοπος	Gen 35,2	–	Sept. Polybius, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus.	εὐ + κόπος
καθαρίζω (4x)	Exod 29,36	–	Sept. Josephus.	καθαρισμός
καθαρισμός	Exod 29,36	–	Sept. P.Mich. 3.185.16, P.Lond. 2.168.11 (II CE).	καθαρίζω
κατακυριεύω	Gen 1,28	–	Sept. Diodorus Siculus.	κατά + κυριεύω, κύριος
κατάλυμα	Exod 4,24	–	Sept. Polybius.	κατά + λῦμα
καταπέτασμα	Exod 26,31	*	Sept. Josephus.	καταπετάννυμι, κατά + πετάννυμι
κατέναντι	Gen 2,14	–	Sept. Lucian.	κατά + ἐναντι, ἐν + ἀντί
κατευλόγῳ	Tob 10,14	–	Sept. Plutarch.	κατά + εὐ + λογέω
κοράσιον (5x)	Ruth 2,8	–	Sept. Plutarch.	dim. κόρη Deut 32,10
μακρόθεν (5x)	Gen 21,16	–	Sept. Polybius.	μακρός
μεγίσταν	2Chr 26,18	–	Sept. Josephus.	μέγας
μεθερμηνεύω	Sir 1,30	–	Sept. Polybius, Strabo, Josephus, Plutarch.	μετά + ἐρμηνεύω
μογιλάλος	Isa 35,6	–	Sept. Claudius Ptolemy Mathematician (II CE).	μόγις + λαλέω
μύλος	Exod 11,5	–	Sept. Strabo, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Athenaus.	μύλη
νάρδος	Cant 1,12	–	Sept. Strabo, Plutarch.	Possible loanword
νυμφών	Tob 6,4		Sept. Heliodorus Novelist (III-IV CE), Pausanias (II CE).	νύμφην
όλοκαύτωμα	Exod 10,25	*	Sept. Josephus.	δλόκαυστος, ὄλος + καυστός καίω
παράπτωμα	Ps 18,13	–	Sept. Polybius.	παραπίπτω
πάσχα (4x)	Exod 12,21	*	Sept. Josephus, Philo, Athenaeus.	Aramaic
περίσσευμα	Qoh 2,15	–	Sept. Plutarch.	περισσός, περί
προσεγγίζω	Gen 3,6	–	Sept. Polybius, Diodorus Siculus.	ἐξ + αὐτῆς

SEPTUAGINTAL WORDS	LXX	M	ATTESTATION	ROOT IN LXX
προσευχή	2Sam 7,27	*	Sept. Josephus, Philo.	πρός + εὔχομαι
πρόσκαιρος	4Macc 15,2	X	Sept. Josephus, Strabo, Plutarch.	πρός + καιρός
σάββατον (11x)	Exod 16,23	*	Sept. BGU 20.2846 (50 BCE), P.Cair.Zen. 4.59762.6 (III BCE).	Aramaic
σκανδαλίζω (8x)	Sir 9,5	–	Sept. P.Oxy 2407.5.43 (III CE).	σκάνδαλον
σκοτίζω	Ps 68,24	–	Sept. Dionysius of Hal., Plutarch.	σκοτός
συλλαλέω	Exod 34,35	–	Sept. Polybius, Strabo, Plutarch.	σύν + λαλέω
συμβούλιον (2x)	4Macc 17,17	–	Sept. Josephus, Plutarch.	συμβάλλω
συνανάκειμαι	3Macc 5,39	*	Sept. Diodorus Siculus, Strabo.	σύν + ἀνά + κείμαι
τρυμαλιά	Judg 6,2	*	Sept. Plutarch.	τρῦμα, τρύω
ὑπολήνιον	Isa 16,10	*	Sept. Pollux (II CE).	ὑπο + λήνιον
ψευδοπροφήτης	Jer 6,13	*	Sept. Josephus, Philo.	ψευδο + προφήτης
ἁμὴν (14x)	1Chr 16,6	X	Sept.	Aramaic
ἀναθεματίζω	3Macc 5,39	*	Sept.	ἀνάθεμα, ἀνατίθημι
βδέλυγμα	Dan 12,11	*	Sept.	βδελύσσω Exod 5,21
ελωι	Judg 5,5	X	Sept.	Aramaic
ἐνταλμα	Isa 29,13	–	Sept.	ἐντολή
εὐλογητός	Gen 12,2	*	Sept.	εὖ + λόγος
μοιχαλὶς	Prov 18,22	*	Sept.	μοιχός
οὐαί (2x)	Num 21,29	*	Sept.	Interjection
πειρασμός	Exod 17,7	*	Sept.	πειράζω, πειρά
προσάβατον	Ps 92,1	*	Sept.	πρός + σάββατον
σατανᾶς (5x)	Sir 21,27	*	Sept.	Aramaic
σκληροκαρδία (2x)	Deut 10,16	*	Sept.	σκληρός + καρδία

Of these 119 post-Aristotelian lemmas, 61 appear in the LXX whereas 58 do not. Of these 58 lemmas, 34 are exclusively post-Aristotelian and do not appear in the LXX (G4), while 24 are exclusive to Mark or the NT and are not attested in others sources (G3).

Mark contains 48 lemmas which are found in the LXX and are also attested only in post-Classical authors (G2). That is to say, they are words found universally in Koine Greek and are not specific to the LXX. The 35 post-Classical words which appear in the LXX are almost all derived or composed from words that were in use previously in Classical Greek.

Table 6 – Post-Aristotelian words

<i>Postaristotelian Words: 119</i>			
<i>LXX: 61</i>		<i>Not LXX: 58</i>	
G1. Only LXX and not attested in post-Classical authors	G2. LXX and Post-Classical	G3. Only NT or Mark	G4. Only Post
13	48	24	34

The 34 Markan lemmas which are exclusively post-Aristotelian (G4) are attested in a number of authors from the Koine era such as Polybius, Plutarch, Josephus, etc., as well as in papyri and inscriptions⁸⁰. Their presence reflects the normal changes expected in the language⁸¹. They are also derived or compounded from words of the Classical period.

In Mark there are only 24 lemmas not attested in other authors (G3, except NT writers), papyri or inscriptions or only in a very late attestation. These words are few and almost all coincide with the Latin loanwords and Aramaic switches of code. The exceptions are: ἐκπερισσῶς, ἐνταφιασμός, ἐπισυντρέχω, κατεξουσιάζω (Mt), κεφαλιάω, παιδιόθεν, προμεριμνάω, πρωτοκαθεδρία (Mt, Lk), συσταυρόω (Mt, Jn, Rom), ὑπερπερισσῶς, ὑστέρησις and ψευδόχριστος.

All Markan *hapax legomena* in the NT appear in the Classical or post-Classical authors except ἐξουθενέω, καταβαρύνω, παιδιόθεν, προσάββατον, which appear in the LXX, but not in the rest of the NT.

In sum, most of Mark's vocabulary is both Classical and Septuagintal (1,067 lemmas, 85.98%) which confirms the close relationship between the LXX and Classical Greek⁸². The more recent discoveries of papyri

⁸⁰ "It is a mistake to regard inscriptions and papyri uniformly as witnesses to vernacular or popular Greek": J.A.L. LEE, "The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Documentary Evidence", *Die Sprache der Septuagint/The Language of the Septuagint* (eds. E. BONS – J. JOOSTEN) (LXX.H 3; Gütersloh 2016) 98-108, here 102.

⁸¹ Morgenthaler's statistic (column II) is wrong in many cases. MORGENTHALER, *Statistik*, 175-176.

⁸² "La grande masse du vocabulaire de la LXX appartient à la langue grecque classique": M. HARL, "La langue de la Septante", *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (eds. G. DORIVAL – M. HARL – O. MUNNICH) (Paris 1988) 223-266, here 243.

and inscriptions confirm this connection ⁸³. The words appearing neither in Classical Greek nor in the LXX are words derived or compounded from roots that are found in the Classical Greek and in the LXX. According to Marguerite Harl: "There are almost no words in the LXX which the reader could not easily understand from a root known to them. The vocabulary of the LXX is not 'barbaric'. Its language is properly Greek" ⁸⁴.

This analysis confirms that the vocabulary of Mark belongs to the normal Greek of its time ⁸⁵. Only ten lemmas in Mark are not attested in the Greek language ⁸⁶ (included Latin and Aramaic words) which confirms Deissmann's conclusion from one hundred years ago that "the list of words considered 'peculiar' to the New Testament and/or the LXX has been steadily reduced so that less than one percent of the vocabulary of the entire New Testament is yet without parallel" ⁸⁷. According to G.H.R. Horsley, the Septuagint translators and the NT authors wrote in the language of their time, without inventing words or giving new meanings to old words in order to express their ideas ⁸⁸.

Nonetheless, the convergence of Mark's vocabulary and that of the LXX is far from coincidental. Even those words used in Mark that are not found in the LXX are not far removed from it. Several of these words have roots which appear in the LXX and are close in meaning to them. On the other hand, the use of words not appearing in the LXX and especially the use of loanwords, even though not neologisms, reflect the author's freedom as a writer.

VI. CONCLUSION

Several conclusions regarding the vocabulary of the Gospel of Mark can be drawn from this analysis.

⁸³ Montevocchi insists on the correspondence between the lexicon of papyri and that of the LXX. O. MONTEVECCHI, "La lingua dei papiri e quella della versione dei LXX: due realtà che si illuminano a vicenda", *AnScR* 1 (1996) 71-80.

⁸⁴ HARL, "La langue", 247. "The bulk of the Pentateuch vocabulary is the same as that of contemporary Greek": J.A.L. LEE, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (Chico, CA 1983) 146.

⁸⁵ "Le vocabulaire du Nouveau Testament est-il le même que celui du monde méditerranéen hellénophone du I^{er} siècle après Jésus-Christ?": WEIGER, "Le Vocabulaire", 440.

⁸⁶ Cicero frequently employs in his letters Greek words which do not occur elsewhere, but from his use of them we may infer that these words were generally familiar. ABBOTT, *Essays*, 87.

⁸⁷ A. DEISSMANN, *Light from the Ancient East*. The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World (London 1910) 78.

⁸⁸ G.H.R. HORSLEY, "Divergent Views on the Nature of the Greek of the Bible", *Biblica* 65 (1984) 393-403, here 398-399.

First, Mark's vocabulary is closely related (90%) to that of the Septuagint. The Markan words not found in the LXX (128) are almost all compound or derivate words from roots appearing in the LXX. This number could be reduced to as few as 43 words whose roots do not appear in the LXX.

Second, Mark's vocabulary belongs to that of first-century Koine Greek. Only six words (excluding the Aramaic and Latin words) are only attested in Mark (Markan *hapax legomena*): ἐκπερισσῶς, ἐπισυντρέχω, κεφαλῶ, παιδιόθεν, προμεριμνάω and ὑπερπερισσῶς. Moreover, 90% of the Markan words are attested before Aristotle, and the remaining 119 post-Aristotelian words are also to be found in the vocabulary of several authors writing in a high style (Polybius, Josephus, Philo, etc.). This confirms previous studies which concluded that the Greek of the LXX and the NT are representative of the Greek of their time. The Greek words in the Gospel which do not appear in Classical Greek or in the Septuagint are all derivatives or compound words from well-known roots. These words illustrate the flexibility of the Greek language in generating new words as well as the natural evolution of the language.

The exceptions to these previous assertions are the unexpected Aramaic words and switches of code from Aramaic to Greek that appear in the Gospel, together with the Latin words found in it. Although the Greek language was reluctant to accept loanwords, Mark's usage is reflective of the contact language situation that existed between Greek and Latin in the first century and which resulted in the acceptance of several of these loanwords by a number of Greek authors, papyri and inscriptions. With the exception of the Aramaic words present, this reflects the evolution of the Greek language in the first century. The Aramaic switches of code could be a sign of the author's multilingualism which explains why these Aramaic sentences and words and their translations have been used to develop sociolinguistic, literary and narrative functions.

Third, the comparison of Mark's vocabulary with the vocabulary of other works reveals part of the intention and style of their authors. On the one hand, Josephus and Philo wrote in a high style with almost no loanwords, and their vocabularies are not particularly related to the Septuagint (sharing the same ratio of coincidence with the Septuagint as Polybius, Epictetus, Philostratus, Xenophon or Isocrates). Although in his *Antiquities* Josephus rewrote several narratives of the LXX covering similar material and using a similar register to the Gospel, his vocabulary, style and genre differ from that of the Gospel, with a much wider vocabulary that goes beyond that of the LXX. The Koine Greek of Polybius and Epictetus also exhibits a wider range of non-LXX vocabulary than Mark. In comparison

to these works, Mark, Paul and *Joseph and Aseneth* show a clear connection with the Septuagint in terms of style, vocabulary and intertextuality.

In sum, Mark's vocabulary reflects a strong connection with the LXX. Other elements such as expressions, idioms, characters, the world of the text, and quotations also link Mark's story with the books of the LXX. Recognizing the clear intention of the author to connect his narrative to that found of the books of the Septuagint is an important tool for interpreting and understanding the Gospel.

La Salle University
Madrid

Alfredo DELGADO GÓMEZ

SUMMARY

This article compares Mark's vocabulary with the Septuagint's vocabulary and with the Greek of its time. The relationship of the vocabulary of other works close to Mark's Gospel is also contrasted with the LXX. These works have been chosen because of their Jewish register (Paul, Josephus, Philo, *Joseph and Aseneth*), closeness in terms of literary genre (*Life of Apollonius*, *Evagoras*, *Agesilaus*) or linguistic variety (Polibius, Epictetus) with Mark. Mark's vocabulary is also placed in his contemporary context to understand his semantic options. This analysis concludes that 90% of Mark's vocabulary is Septuagintal. The 128 Markan words not found in the LXX could be reduced to as few as 43 words whose roots do not appear in the LXX.

PAUL AND DANGEROUS DEVOUT WOMEN OF HIGH-STANDING IN ACTS

One of Luke's major purposes in Luke-Acts is to highlight the inclusion of all peoples in the church. His theme of inclusivity among the people of God is widely recognized ¹. Among those who are welcomed include social groups that functioned on the fringe of normative Judaism: Gentiles, Samaritans, eunuchs, the sick, poor, the physically challenged, and the oppressed ². While some scholarly lists of these categories do include "women", they do not typically include "socially powerful women". Yet a careful reading of exegetical subtleties in Acts points to Luke's sustained interest in describing "devout women of high standing" (partial converts to Judaism or "God-fearers") as having great potential: either as fearsome foes or virtuous converts to the Way ³.

Luke selects and highlights this socio-cultural category of women. But for what purpose? The presence of some God-fearing women who reject and accept the "word of the Lord" suggests that something other than mere description is going on. Luke's interest in "leading women" among the Hellenistic cities that Paul visited was so unsettling to early ecclesiastics that some care was given to edit them out of some manuscripts in the Western text tradition. This early manuscript evidence suggests that even ancient readers had difficulty understanding why Luke drew attention to the role of powerful God-fearing women.

¹ Here I define the "people of God" along the lines of the comment by K. YAMAZAKI-RANSOM (*The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative* [LNTS 404; London 2010] 133): "Luke redefines the people of God as those who acknowledge that 'the Messiah was Jesus'". Additionally, I would add that Luke's definition of the "people of God" has expanded under the new covenant, so that the "boundaries of the people of Israel and the people of God are not the same" (D. RAVENS, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* [LNTS 119; London 1995] 208 n. 128).

² The literature on Luke's theme of inclusivity is extensive. On the inclusion of socially fringe groups and Gentiles amongst the disciples in Luke-Acts, see D. BOCK, *A Theology of Luke and Acts*. Biblical Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI 2012) 296-297. This list of fringe groups included Samaritans and eunuchs according to A.J. THOMPSON, *Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus*. Luke's Account of God's Unfolding Plan (NSBT 27; Downers Grove, IL 2011) 271. F. THIELMAN (*Theology of the New Testament*. A Canonical and Synthetic Approach [Grand Rapids, MI 2005] 135) comments on Luke's emphasis on the inclusion of the "sick, the poor, the oppressed".

³ The characteristics that would point to an intentional comparison between these groups may have been neglected due to atomistic studies that neglect broader narrative forces in the Book of Acts. By "atomistic exegesis" I mean commentary on the text that moves verse-by-verse but rarely considers wider literary contexts.

This study demonstrates that Luke is intentionally drawing a comparison using three similar groups of prominent Gentile women in order to serve his ecclesial message of radical inclusivity in the people of God and to offer a pattern for similar encounters by his readers. Luke's contrasting portraits of "devout women of high standing" offered his implied readers several strategies for engagement with this potentially dangerous social group.

The argument of this paper proceeds in three main sections before the conclusion. The first section identifies God-fearing women in different cities as a collective subject by highlighting their unifying qualities. The second section explains how data from ancient manuscripts illuminates the challenge posed by these narratives in the book of Acts. The third section addresses the question: what is Luke doing by foregrounding this group of women? At least part of the answer is that Luke is providing examples for how the people of God should deal with dangerous women.

I. A COLLECTIVE SUBJECT IN THE HELLENISTIC WORLD

Luke creates a contrast using three references to the same socio-cultural group of women, and the similarities of these groups suggest that they function as a unified collective subject ⁴. The first text in this comparison describes Paul and Barnabas' ministry in Antioch in Pisidia and the subsequent rejection: "But the Jews incited the devout women of high standing [τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας τὰς εὐσχήμονας] and the leading men of the city, stirred up persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and drove them out of their district" (Acts 13,50). The second text considers the reception of Paul and Silas' ministry in Thessalonica among some of the Jews and among "a great many of the devout [τῶν σεβομένων] Greeks and not a few of the leading women [γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγαι]" (Acts 17,4). After a mob drove them from Thessalonica, the third description of Paul and Silas' trip in Berea describes an equally successful encounter, with some Jews believing their gospel message, "with not a few Greek women of high standing [τῶν Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν τῶν εὐσχημόνων] as well as men" (Acts 17,12).

The identity of these groups of women as collective subjects stands alongside many other references to individual God-fearers in Luke-Acts ⁵.

⁴ Here I aim to develop and apply R.J. Myles' lens of critical crowd theory to the presence of the apostles and their function as instruments of social, political, and religious change; see R.J. MYLES, "Crowds and Power in the Early Palestinian Tradition", *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 18 (2020) 124-140, here 125.

⁵ For references in the NT to "God-fearers" see Acts 2,5; 10,2; 13,50; 17,4; 17,17; 18,7, and S. McKNIGHT, "Proselytism and Godfearers", *Dictionary of New Testament*

Several of the named God-fearers also had qualities that would have made them powerful or socially prominent. One of the most noteworthy and socially powerful “God-fearers” in the Gospel of Luke is the centurion who has his servant/child healed by Jesus (Luke 7,1-10) ⁶. There is also Titius Justus who was “a worshipper of God, whose house was next to the synagogue” (Acts 18,7). He is likely to be identified by the same name of “Crispus” who was “the leader of the synagogue” (18,8) and became a disciple of Jesus (cf. 1 Cor 1,1). Additionally, the person of Lydia (Acts 16,14-15) is described as a “God-fearer” and “seller of purple goods”. Not only was she able to financially support Paul and his companions, but the purple clothes were likely sold to wealthy and powerful individuals ⁷. According to this study, the references to groups of God-fearing women function in much the same way as these named individuals, as their actions may be representative of their socio-cultural group.

The “women of high standing” from Thessalonica in Acts 17,4 was a category of Gentile “God-fearers” who are carefully differentiated from those who are fully Jewish ⁸. It is significant to observe that Thessalonica was a Hellenistic and predominantly Gentile city. This group of women are described as being “Hellenistic” or “Greek” in order to differentiate them from ethnic Jews. The “women of high standing” from Berea in Acts 17,12 are also a category of Gentile “God-fearers”. As in 17,4, this group of women are described as being “Hellenistic” or “Greek” for the purpose of differentiating them from those were ethnically Jewish.

The argument of this paper hinges on comparisons made between groups that are described with slightly different descriptions. Thus, one of the first questions to consider when evaluating Luke’s description of women in Acts is whether the “leading women” (13,50) are the same socio-cultural group of God-fearers as the “devout women of high standing” (17,12). This can be answered by the semantic overlap between the adjectives τῶν πρώτων and εὐσχήμων and then by considering examples

Background (eds. C.A. EVANS – S.E. PORTER) (Downers Grove, IL 2000) 840-847. On God-fearers in Jewish perspective see Midrash *Deut. Rab.* 2,24.

⁶ For a study of God-fearing soldiers in Luke-Acts, see A. KYRYCHENKO, *The Roman Army and the Expansion of the Gospel*. The Role of the Centurion in Luke-Acts (BZNW 203; Berlin 2014).

⁷ The color purple (*argaman*) was associated with the clothing of royalty in the ancient world (1 Macc 10,62; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 4.71). Purple dye was typically derived from a gland in three species of mollusk indigenous to the Mediterranean Sea. There are references to King Solomon using purple for royal upholstery (Cant 3,9-10). The imagery of a purple robe was used by the Roman soldiers to mock Jesus’ kingship (Mark 15,17; John 19,2). Additionally, the book of Revelation (18,12) lists purple cloth as being among the items traded by wealthy merchants.

⁸ So also D.J. WILLIAMS, *Acts* (UBCS; Grand Rapids, MI 2011) 295.

of usage that might suggest how this overlap would have been understood in the ancient world ⁹.

A word of qualification is in order before proceeding. It is possible that the adjectival phrase τῶν πρώτων in 13,50 refers to women's derivative leadership or to their status as wives of the leading men ¹⁰. It is certainly possible that some of these women were married to leaders in the community. However, it is unlikely that Luke uses the label "leading women" for women who are deriving this identity *solely* from their spouse. Whatever status these women derived from their spouses, Luke's narratives are keen to consider those who are "first" on their own merits. This means that Luke includes these women because of their capacity to act on their own accord, using their own powers for the purpose of persecution ¹¹.

Luke uses the adjectival phrase τῶν πρώτων to describe those who had the honor of having leadership roles within the city. For example, this adjective is applied to the city of Philippi, which is called a "leading [πρώτης] city of the district of Macedonia" (16,12). This is widely regarded as describing the honor, rank, or dignity of the city itself, rather than the order of Paul's arrival during his travels ¹². The Gospel of Luke (15,22) uses this adjective in the Parable of the Prodigal Son to describe the father's "best [πρώτην] robe". When applied to individuals in relation to a group of people in the Lukan corpus, this adjective can mean "leaders". This is evident in the description of Jesus' opponents: "the chief priests and the scribes and the principal [πρωτοὶ] men of the people" (Luke 19,47). In Acts (25,2), the same sense occurs when describing the opponents of Paul: "the chief priests and the principal men [οἱ πρωτοὶ] of the Jews". The word is used again to describe the leader of Malta as the "chief [τῷ πρώτῳ] man of the island" (28,7). Lastly, the word is used to describe Paul's final meeting with the Jewish leaders in Rome (28,17): "he called together the local leaders [πρώτους] of the Jews". Outside the Lukan corpus, the word appears in Mark (6,21) to identify those who were invited

⁹ Additional vocabulary beyond the scope of this study was used for leaders of high social standing in the community. For comparison, Josephus (*Ant.* 20.191) refers to men who were responsible for building additions on the Temple as τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν οἱ προύχοντες ("Jerusalemites of high standing").

¹⁰ D.G. PETERSON, *Acts* (PNTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 479 n. 14.

¹¹ Ruth the Moabite is an example of a Gentile woman who does not relate to Judaism based on marriage or ethnicity but by her own confession of faith demonstrated with loyalty (Ruth 1,16).

¹² J.A. FITZMYER (*Acts* [AB 31; New Haven, CT 2008] 584) comments: "Some commentators have tried to say that it [πρώτης] means the 'first' city to which Paul came in the district of Macedonia. That would not be accurate, because he came first to Neapolis, and it otherwise strains the Greek syntax".

to Herod's birthday banquet: "his nobles and military commanders and the leading men [τοῖς πρώτοις] of Galilee".

These women of "high standing" were possessors of social status and honor. This is evident by the use of εὐσχήμων, which has semantic overlap with the concept of possessing honor or social status. In an example from Mark (15,43), Joseph of Arimathea, who took possession of Jesus' dead body, is described as "a respected [εὐσχήμων] member of the council". Paul uses the same word metaphorically for "presentable" or "honorable" parts of the body that are displayed in public (1 Cor 12,24). It is noteworthy that the Western text (D) has a variant in Acts 17,34 in which "a woman named Damaris" was of "high standing" [εὐσχήμων]. Most importantly, in the description of the male leadership in Antioch in Pisidia (13,50), reference to "leading [τοὺς πρώτους] men of the city" occurs in the same sentence with "devout women of high standing [τὰς εὐσχήμονας]". These two groups of people were working in tandem. This example places both adjectives in the same sentence, and both words are applied to groups working together socially (as both groups were found to be useful by the Jewish leaders who incited them). This is also the only example in the NT where these two words occur in the same sentence.

The socio-rhetorical power of this contrast lies in their similarity: that all three groups of women (13,50; 17,4; 17,11-12) were arguably "God-fearers" or partial Gentile converts to Judaism. These women were also leaders in the community due to their husbands' honorable social status and/or their wealth¹³. In each of these texts, the women are referred to in the plural and Luke draws attention to the number of them with the phrase "and not a few" [οὐκ ὀλίγα] in 17,4 and 17,12 (in the masculine form). The narrative descriptions are also often in context with crowds and mob action. These features establish these women as groups with their own characteristics. In addition to the rather obvious fact that Luke has utilized gender as an element of similarity, the following consideration of each textual unit demonstrates that these women also share socio-religious characteristics.

The "women of high standing" from Antioch in Acts 13,50 are arguably a category of "God-fearers". The text (13,50) refers to them as "devout"

¹³ D.W.J. GILL ("Acts and the Urban Elites", in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting* [eds. D.W.J. GILL – C. GEMPF – B.W. WINTER] [BAFCS 2; Grand Rapids, MI 1994] 115) comments: "Women could be quite wealthy in the Roman world". One prominent though debated example is Poppaea Sabina, the wife of Nero, whom Josephus describes with the phrase: θεοσεβῆς γὰρ ἦν (*Ant.* 20.195). S. MATTHEWS ("Ladies' Aid: Gentile Noblewomen as Saviors and Benefactors in the *Antiquities*", *HTR* 92 [1999] 199-218, here 205) explains that this could mean that she was a Jewish proselyte or simply that she was superstitious.

[σεβομένης] women. The adjective “devout” [εὐσεβής] functioned as a technical term for those who were “attracted to Judaism” but were not Jews ¹⁴. The fact that these women were distinct in some manner from the “Jews” is evident by the fact that it is “the Jews” who incite them (13,50) ¹⁵. However, as C.K. Barrett points out, these Jews have access to these women, suggesting that they are “adherents of the synagogue” ¹⁶. The flow of the Antioch narrative (13,43) describes “many Jews and devout converts to Judaism” [πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων] who followed and encouraged Paul and Barnabas. In this case, the “women of high standing” who persecuted Paul and Barnabas at Antioch were part of the proselytes who were in the synagogue. Conceptually, this pattern also appears in Iconium as Luke describes it: “the people of the city were divided” (14,4).

Table 1 – Devout Women of High Standing in Acts

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Reference to Women</i>
13.50	Antioch in Pisidia	Negative	τὰς σεβομένης γυναῖκας τὰς εὐσχήμονας
17.4	Thessalonica	Positive	τῶν τε σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολὺ, γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγαι
17.12	Berea	Positive	τῶν Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν τῶν εὐσχημόνων

To summarize, the descriptors of these three groups (13,50; 17,4; 17,11-12) would have alerted the reader of Acts that they were all part of the same type of social-cultural group: devout women God-fearers who were partial Gentile converts to Judaism. These groups of women likely had substantial numbers and influence within local politics ¹⁷. The logic of this section may be summarized thus: if the “women of high standing” and the “leading men” were of the same socio-cultural group in Antioch, then it most likely follows that “women of high standing” were of the same socio-cultural group as “leading women” elsewhere in Asia Minor. It seems quite likely that Luke understood “leading women” and “women of high standing” to be identical or closely related social categories of Gentile God-fearers. In other words, the socio-cultural category identified as “leading

¹⁴ E.A. PHILLIPS, “Early Church Demographics”, in *Lexham Geographic Commentary on Acts through Revelation* (eds. B.J. BEITZEL – J. PARKS – D. MANGUM) (Lexham Geographic Commentary; Bellingham, WA 2019) 94-104, here 100.

¹⁵ A point made by C.K. BARRETT, *Acts* (ICC; Edinburgh 2004) 1:659.

¹⁶ BARRETT, *Acts*, 1:659.

¹⁷ J.D.G. DUNN (*Acts* [Grand Rapids, MI 2006] 183) comments that the scene in Antioch “fits with what we know of many Jewish ethnic minority groups within the cities of Asia Minor: that they were substantial in number and influential within local politics”.

women” overlapped with the category of “women of high standing”. This analysis supports the conclusion that the scenarios involving women in Berea, Antioch, and Thessalonica form a set of contrasting portraits. The next section describes how these three specific groups of God-fearers draw attention to their gender as women.

II. PROBLEMATIC AND POWERFUL WOMEN ACCORDING TO TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The most powerful evidence that Luke intended to foreground or emphasize women in the texts under consideration is that text-critical data (textual variants in the Western text tradition) points to the conclusion that ancient readers were concerned about it ¹⁸. This is not surprising, given the fact that other texts demonstrate that ancient readers redacted texts to transform women into men ¹⁹.

This does not mean there was a “programmatic effort” to mold the text of Acts in a certain theological direction through scribal changes ²⁰. Rather, there is a narrow set of textual variants that suggests ancient writers observed the prominence of women in certain narratives and may have been inclined to alter them ²¹. A case in point is found in 17,4, as the Western text reads: “*and wives* of the leading men” rather than “and not a few of the leading women”. Similarly, in 17,12, the Western text inserts “and men” (“... and many of the Greeks *and men* and women of high standing”). It is not easy to explain these variants in terms of harmonization ²².

¹⁸ E.J. EPP (*Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* [SNTSMS 3; Cambridge 1966] 75) concludes that the D-text variant of 17,12 loses all “emphasis” on the women.

¹⁹ For a discussion of *Paulus ex Festo* in which *flaminicae* (“priestesses” in Roman cults) were changed into *flaminibus* (“male priests”) by different redactors, see L. COHICK, *Women in the World of Earliest Christians*. Illuminating Ancient Ways of Life (Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 160.

²⁰ L. HURTADO (*Texts and Artefacts*. Selected Essays on Textual Criticism and Early Christian Manuscripts [LNTS 584; London 2018] 80) concludes: “We do not see a programmatic effort to insert Jesus or God, but instead it seems that readers engaged each of these variation-units on a case-by-case basis, simply seeking to grasp what they thought the text meant”.

²¹ This is a long-standing assertion. See B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 4th Rev. Edition (New York 1994) 403, who references a comment by P.H. MENOUD on Acts 17,12: “the antifeminist tendency of the writer of D seems to be more or less general in the last decades of the first century. In any case it is not one of the major trends in the thought of the Western recension”.

²² B.D. EHRLMANN (*The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament [Oxford 2011] 54 n. 124) comments that “[h]armonizations, for example, are made with far greater frequency” than intentional modifications of the New Testament text.

This text critical evidence suggests that the place of women had been intentionally diminished, thus supporting the conclusion that the copyist had read the text as one which foregrounded women. We can only hypothesize about why this manuscript tradition seems to intentionally editorialize these prominent women. However, there are four characteristics of these three narratives which may have provided the basis for concern among ancient copyists.

First, the women are foregrounded by being listed before men in Antioch (13,50) and Berea (17,12) and being described exclusive of men in Thessalonica (17,4). Luke uses word order or distributional markedness to emphasize certain aspects of communication²³. For example, Luke uses word order with Saul and Barnabas to highlight primacy or leadership²⁴. Elsewhere in Acts (19,21), Luke emphasizes the concept of the divine plan of God by placing the word δεῖ forward in the word order²⁵.

Second, the women receive more narrative time than men do in select narratives. In other words, in these three select narratives under discussion, they receive more details and description than the men do, again marking them as prominent. For example, C.K. Barrett observes that in 13,50, there is “no technical term for the chief men of the city, as he has in some later narratives (e.g. 16,20)”²⁶. This means that Luke applies thicker descriptions to the women when compared to the men.

Third, Luke’s word choice suggests that he is drawing an intentional comparison between these women. The phrase “women of high standing” is used in both Acts 13,50 and 17,12. The use of the adjective εὐσχήμων is only applied to women in these two texts in the entire New Testament, suggesting that Luke intentionally used this specific phraseology to create a contrast. The argument that Luke is foregrounding the women in these three instances is further supported by the fact that elsewhere he lumps men and women together without distinction, as in the description of the conflict at Iconium: “But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles” (14,2). According to this present study, Luke could have easily used the same generalizations in these texts, thus drawing attention to his word choice.

²³ I.S.C. KWONG (*The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke*. Its Foregrounded Messages [LNTS 298; London 2005] 33 n. 8) defines “distributional markedness” as prominence drawn mainly from “frequency and distribution of various word order patterns”.

²⁴ The word order is “Barnabas and Paul” in Acts 11,25-26; 12,25; 13,2,7, and this subtly shifts to “Paul and Barnabas” in 13,43. As an alternate explanation, F.F. BRUCE (*The Book of Acts* [NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1988] 276) suggests that Luke follows the word order “Barnabas and Paul” when he is following verbatim an unknown source.

²⁵ D. BOCK (*Acts* [BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2007] 605) comments on the phrase δεῖ με καὶ ῥώμην ἰδεῖν in 19,21: “The word [δεῖ] is placed forward in the Greek word order for emphasis”.

²⁶ BARRETT, *Acts*, 1:660.

Fourth, Luke's use of literary contrasts as a rhetorical tool has been widely recognized, and commentators have observed its presence in multiple strata of the Lukan corpus. For example, Luke uses intertextual citations from the prophet Amos to create a contrast²⁷. John Polhill suggests that chapters 16–19 evidence an “equal balance between opposition initiated by Jews and that begun by Gentiles”²⁸. In the very context under consideration (Acts 17), Luke has arguably juxtaposed Diaspora Jews who were jealous and destructive in Thessalonica with reflective Jews in Berea. It is significant for the present argument that the purpose of juxtaposition is to undermine any stereotype about the responses of Diaspora Jews to the gospel of the risen Lord Jesus²⁹.

To summarize, the Western text-critical tradition points to the presence of ancient readers in the church who could not understand why Luke was drawing attention to devout women of high standing in Thessalonica and Berea, where they were portrayed as powerful in numbers, in zeal and influence. The qualities of these narratives indicates that they should be read as focused primarily on the women, even though both genders are mentioned. These ancient copyists did not seem to understand that Luke was presenting his implied readers with a set of strategies for missional engagement with diaspora Jewish communities.

III. STRATEGIES FOR ENGAGING DANGEROUS WOMEN

We return once again to the question: what is Luke doing by emphasizing the role of devout God-fearing women in various Hellenistic cities? Before addressing this question, it will be helpful to recall with Bonnie Thurston that Saul persecuted both male and female Christians (Acts 8,3; 9,2), indicating “both that women were full members of the Christian community and that they were considered by Saul as equally dangerous”³⁰. The devout women of high standing were a social group with great potential for harm or for good. This section demonstrates that Luke is at least

²⁷ A.W. WHITE, “Revisiting the ‘Creative’ Use of Amos in Acts and What it Tells Us About Luke”, *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 46 (2016) 79–90.

²⁸ J.B. POLHILL (NAC; *Acts* [Nashville, TN 1992] 361) notes that opposition comes “twice by Jews (17,5–7; 18,12–13), twice by Gentiles (16,19–21; 19,24–27) in formal accusations before the authorities”.

²⁹ PETERSON (*Acts*, 475) comments: “The juxtaposition of jealous, persecuting Jews in Thessalonica with eager, reflective Jews in Berea shows that ‘the narrator has not completely stereotyped Diaspora Jews’”.

³⁰ B. THURSTON, *Women in the New Testament. Questions and Commentary* (New York 1998) 118.

providing examples for how the people of God should deal with dangerous women such as these.

Luke's contrast between these groups of women is uneven: with a ratio of two-to-one, instances of "women of high standing" accepting the word of the Lord exceed instances where they reject it. This uneven contrast suggests that this is a group of women whom the audience of this document should seek out when on mission. This contrast anticipates the climax of Paul's conflict with the Jews and the pivot to the Gentiles at the end of Acts: "this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen" (28,28). Luke's contrast between these groups of socially powerful God-fearers draws attention to the concept that women such as these can join the people of God on their own accord. Their identity must now be shaped by their response to the gospel and not by social status or cultural stigmas. The following sections identify four different strategies for engagement with devout women of high standing.

1. *Reversing Honor and Shame*

The hermeneutical key to understanding the honor and shame dynamics in these three scenes is Luke's use of bi-polar reversal. The rhetorical feature of bi-polar or double reversal means that those who are first become last and those who are last become first³¹. Within the Lukan corpus, this idea is most clearly articulated by Jesus while describing the messianic banquet at the end of the age. At this messianic banquet invitees will be honored or not according to this paradigm (Luke 13,30): "And indeed, some who are last will be first, and some who are first will be last"³². In Acts (17,6), this same motif is most clearly articulated as the disciples in Thessalonica are charged with "turning the world upside down". John York explains that in the book of Acts, "bi-polar reversal as a theme gives way to a community in which the divine principles have been enacted"³³.

Both the men and women in Antioch who drove Paul and Barnabas "out of their district" are given adjectives identifying them as either powerful or socially prominent. The devout women were "of high standing" and the men were "leading" (13,50). These descriptive details support the argument

³¹ On Luke's use of bi-polar reversal, see J.O. YORK, *The Last Shall Be First*. The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke (JSNTSup 46; Sheffield 1991) 42; D.H. WENKEL, *Joy in Luke-Acts*. The Intersection of Rhetoric, Narrative, and Emotion (Paternoster Biblical Monographs; Milton Keynes, UK 2015) 2-3; K. ROWE, *World Upside Down*. Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age (Oxford 2009) 92.

³² Parallel texts of Luke 13,30 appear in Mark 10,31 and Matt 19,30.

³³ YORK, *The Last Shall be First*, 172.

that Luke is intentionally drawing attention to their social status. Luke is arguably interested in this group of people because they were actually described as being “first”. They are “first” on two accounts. They are “first” according to the pyramid of honor (below Caesar and some others, of course, but still high in social ranking) *and* they are “first” among the Gentiles to receive the gospel as the apostles “turned to the Gentiles” (13,46). And yet they refuse to accept the word of the Lord. This is an example of bi-polar reversal: those who are first will be last and those who would have honor in the community will be dishonored at judgment day (13,52). The large group of “leading women” in Thessalonica are characterized as having received the word of the Lord that Jesus is “king” (17,7). They receive this word as a result of Paul’s work of reasoning, explaining, and proving from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ (17,2-3). However, it is noteworthy that Paul is the one characterized by action verbs and participles. Additionally, Luke portrays this synagogue as being an example of a mixed response. Despite the positive response of one group, another group of Jews was jealous and sought to persecute the apostles.

2. *Encouraging True Nobility*

Luke describes degrees of honor as he differentiates between Berea and Thessalonica when he states (17,11): “Now these Jews were *more noble* than those in Thessalonica; they received the word with all eagerness, examining the Scriptures daily to see if these things were so”. Here, it is evident that the abundance of action taken by Paul to convince his listeners in Thessalonica should have been matched with action on his audience’s part. Those “leading women” in Thessalonica were indeed honorable for believing, but not as honorable as those “women of high standing” in Berea who were examining the Scriptures (17,11). This word εὐγενής (“noble”) is only used elsewhere in the Lukan corpus by Jesus in the Parable of the Ten Minas (Luke 19,11-27) for the “nobleman” who “went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom” (v. 12)³⁴. Such usage only highlights Luke’s emphasis on honor/shame as it relates to receiving the word of God with actions commensurate with the news of a risen messiah.

Luke portrays true nobility as receiving the word of the Lord through belief. Correspondingly, those who were powerful and “first” in the city

³⁴ This word is also used by Paul to describe the disciples’ social status in Corinth (1 Cor 1,26): “not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth [εὐγενεῖς]”.

of Antioch became last, thus fulfilling Jesus' upside-down description of the invitees to the messianic banquet (Luke 13,30). Those who were "last" are the Gentiles who were previously excluded from the people of God but now become "first" in the kingdom of God through faith. These narrative and socio-rhetorical dynamics may have appealed to Luke's implied audience, who likely included women who would have desired to achieve or maintain "nobility". The message is that true nobility in the kingdom of God is found through receiving the word of the Lord.

3. *Responding with Prophetic Action*

Luke's description of Paul's response to the threatening group of women in Antioch is an example of prophetic activity that negotiates through gender conflict with prophetic action. Paul (as a man) does not capitulate to these powerful women who oppose him, thus emasculating himself, in a manner of speaking. Paul does not use his masculine qualities of power and strength to directly counteract these women. Nor does Paul use his social connections or emotional intelligence to respond with his own mob. Rather, Paul engages in prophetic action that directs attention to their response to God's revelation and Christ's role as the eschatological judge of humanity ³⁵.

Luke's contrast between these groups of women in these cities portrays them as public actors, not as creatures whose domain was entirely relegated to the home. Paul's act of shaking the dust from his feet was not likely a hidden, private act that was seen by only a handful of people. Luke portrays Paul as not only willing to engage large crowds but also eagerly seeking to address them as a whole when possible. Thus, it is plausible to envision that Paul stood up before this mixed group, including the powerful women of high standing, and clapped the dust off of his sandals at a high vantage point for maximum impact. Not only does Paul willingly engage large crowds, but he also utilizes movements and physical signals for rhetorical flourish. An example of Paul using hand gestures before a hostile crowd appears in his address before the crowd in Jerusalem (21,40). Such examples support the likelihood that any prophetic action would also

³⁵ A similar scene occurs in the Book of Acts when Paul was rejected in the synagogue: "He shook out his garments and said to them, 'Your blood be on your own heads!'" (18,6). A possible OT parallel is found in Neh 5,13, where the oath required from the priests entailed the following statement: "I also shook out the fold of my garment and said, 'So may God shake out every man from his house and from his labor who does not keep this promise. So may he be shaken out and emptied'".

have been done as publicly as possible. Acceptance or rejection of Paul's gospel is not a response to men (masculinity) per se, but a public response to the "word of the Lord".

4. *Establishing Women as Autonomous Actors*

Luke's depiction of these powerful women treats them as autonomous actors in their own right. Women are not portrayed as wholly passive creatures. Rather, they are either participating in persecution through mob action or searching the Scriptures together. They were equally capable of virtue or vice as men. This stands in contrast with the view of classical philosophers who "supposed that only *men* could be virtuous" ³⁶. In the classical Greek worldview, women were "instinctively natural and subject to natural passions" ³⁷. Similar views may have been prevalent in the Greco-Roman context of these three cities. However, in Luke's narrative, not only were women capable of their own acts of virtue (e.g. faith and works), they could do so through their own intellectual powers as they read the Scriptures to confirm Paul's teaching. The most honorable women are those who act upon the message of the gospel by searching the Scriptures (Acts 17,11).

Luke's presentation of these groups of women undermines the claims of those who might base their identity entirely on social-cultural-religious status. The response to the violent mob that included God-fearing women of high standing suggests that their identity as "God-fearers" may not be secure from the perspective of Jesus-followers. If Paul can state in Romans (9,6) that "not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel", then Luke's narratives seem to suggest that not all who are God-fearers are truly God-fearers. Paul's public encounters with these groups of women confounds any attempt to suggest that their gender, class, or power determines their identity as true "God-fearers".

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that Luke carefully crafted encounters between God-fearing "women of high standing" in order to provide strategies for engagement with this potentially dangerous social group. The

³⁶ B. CAINE (ed.), *Friendship. A History* (New York 2004) xii, emphasis hers.

³⁷ J.A. ARIETI, *Philosophy in the Ancient World. An Introduction* (Lanham, MD 2005) 7 n. 34.

markedness of the texts describing Paul's engagement with crowds in Antioch, Thessalonica, and Berea points to an emphasis on the presence of powerful women. Luke's descriptions of these women of high standing point to an intentional engagement with religious, social, and gender stereotypes. This emphasis on women was so pronounced that some of the early copyists in the Western text tradition may have even made some alterations.

The strategies for engagement include: (1) reversing honor and shame; (2) encouraging true nobility; (3) responding with prophetic action; and (4) establishing women as autonomous actors. The factors that typically shaped identity, including faithful attendance at the synagogue and social status, will not be the determining factors in one's honor in the kingdom of God. Those who are first will be last and those who are last will be first. Among those who do receive the word of the Lord with faith, the most honor goes to those who act upon it and search the Scriptures to confirm the proclamation. When confronting rejection of the news that Jesus is the risen messiah of Israel, Paul's response does not pit male against female or vice versa. Rather, his actions are prophetic, relating the status of the women who reject the "word of the Lord" to God himself. Luke wants to make it clear that those who are truly "God-fearers" will follow Jesus.

The significance of this study lies in its advancement of the well-established motif of Lukan inclusivity by relating it to his goal of Christian identity formation amongst potentially hostile social groups. Can prominent, influential, and devout Gentile women who have been following the basic tenets of Judaism join the people of God? Luke's narrative makes it clear that the answer to this question cannot be based on social stigmas or cultural stereotypes. This question can only be answered by asking whether such women are responding to the "word of the Lord" with faith and repentance. Luke is a champion of inclusion because the cross is the climax of God's plan to fulfill what was revealed to Abraham and the patriarchs: "in your seed all the nations of the earth will be blessed" (Gen 22,18) ³⁸.

821 East Davis Street
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
USA

David H. WENKEL

³⁸ BOCK (*Theology of Luke and Acts*, 282) concludes that the "Messiah's coming both is Israel's story and looks to the inclusion of the nations". See also B.R. WILSON, "The Crucifixion Scene as the Climax of Lukan Inclusivity", *Expository Times* 127.9 (2016) 430-438.

SUMMARY

The book of Acts describes Paul interacting with “devout women of high-standing” in Antioch of Pisidia, Thessalonica, and Berea. These were likely groups of influential Gentile women who regularly attended a local synagogue. In the first instance, Paul’s experience was negative, and this group of women turned against him. But in the next two instances, Paul found favor with them and they willingly received “the word of the Lord”. This paper argues that Luke intentionally contrasts these similar groups of powerful women in order to offer strategies for engaging similar social groups in a Hellenistic milieu.

ROM 15,7-13 REVISITED: PURPOSES AND PROOFS

Recent interpretations of Rom 15,7-13 have raised a number of questions regarding the purposes of Christ becoming “the servant of the circumcision”. The main exegetical issues at stake are the reading of the particles γάρ (v. 8) and δέ (v. 9), the syntax of vv. 8-9a, and the inner coherence of the scriptural catena (vv. 9b-12) within the textual unit. Other than conflicting answers, recent research deals with differing methodological approaches. Some of them pay attention to the grammar, some to the background, but few of them focus on the reasoning as a whole. This paper proposes a fresh review of the lines of thought intertwined in Rom 15,7-13. What is the purpose of Paul’s exhortation? How does he articulate imperatives and rationales in the section?

I. A TEXTUAL SIGNPOST IN ROM 15,8

Casson’s recent monograph has brought to attention the importance of understanding γάρ in Romans. She demonstrates that γάρ functions as a textual signpost in the argument of the letter. Her main contribution consists in her methodological approach. The procedural meaning analysis gives a unified explanation of diverse uses of γάρ in Romans. It has the advantage of giving a cognitively grounded explanation of an argument, it clarifies the reasoning when a causal or consecutive relationship with the preceding material is not obvious, and it clarifies that γάρ encodes processing instructions (rather than concepts). Casson’s study of Rom 15,7-13, for example, seeks to demonstrate that the single occurrence of γάρ is the interpretative key to identify the primary aim of these verses and of the entire letter too. She believes that interpreting γάρ as a procedural signpost in v. 8 may clarify Paul’s reasoning in vv. 7-9 ¹.

¹ S.H. CASSON, *Textual Signposts in the Argument of Romans*. A Relevance-Theory Approach (ECL; Atlanta, GA 2019) 38-39, 245-246. Casson follows Blakemore’s notion of procedural meaning. This notion belongs to the relevance theory framework and is based on a distinction between conceptual information and procedural information. See D. BLAKEMORE, *Semantic Constraints on Relevance* (Oxford 1987) 84-85, 88-90; IDEM, *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning*. The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers (CSL 99; Cambridge 2002) 89. See also D. WILSON, “The Conceptual-Procedural Distinction: Past, Present and Future”, in *Procedural Meaning*. Problems and Perspectives (eds. V. ESCANDELL-VIDAL – M. LEONETTI – A. AHERN) (Oxford 2004) 3-31.

Casson demonstrates that γάρ often indicates a strengthening relationship; however, such a relationship in Rom 15,8 is not straightforward. The difficulty comes from the syntax of the prepositional construction (εἰς τό + infinitive) in v. 8b and the infinitive verbs (βεβαιῶσαι and δοξάσαι) in vv. 8b-9a. For Casson vv. 8-9 constitute a complex of strengthening premises depending on the clause λέγω + γάρ in v. 8a. She identifies v. 7b as a good example of a verse strengthened by a γάρ clause. However, “since verse 7b itself serves as a theological rationale for the exhortation in verse 7a”², Casson suggests that v. 7b reinforces in turn the importance of v. 7a. In fact, her analysis underscores the following series in vv. 8b-9a to the extent that they function as a theological support for the exhortation to mutual welcoming in verse 7a. Based on the cotext and on the procedural reading of γάρ³, Casson prefers the *dual-purpose* interpretation of vv. 8b-9a because this reading provides a theological rationale for the exhortation of v. 7a⁴. On the same ground she excludes the *single-purpose* interpretation.

It is true that the guidance given by γάρ in Rom 15,8 triggers an inferential sequence in vv. 8a-9b and introduces the theological motivation for the exhortation to mutual welcome (v. 7a). It is also true that this theological rationale might better correspond to both Gentile and Jewish addressees. Yet, Casson’s assumption “that the information following γάρ in verses 8-9a is to be processed as strengthening premises” for v. 7 also takes for granted that the particle δέ in v. 9a must be understood as a coordinating conjunction, like καί⁵. Her analysis of vv. 8b-9a, no matter the identity of the addressees (ὁμᾶς), reads both infinitives as depending on εἰς τό and so views δοξάσαι as being parallel with βεβαιῶσαι: “Christ became a servant of the circumcised [...], in order to confirm the promises to the patriarchs *and* in order that the Gentiles may glorify God for his mercy”⁶. Casson’s procedural reading of γάρ is closely linked to her

² CASSON, *Textual Signposts*, 251.

³ The relevance-theoretic approach demands that the reader discern the previous cotext as a significant vehicle of contextual information. The cotext refers to the linguistic material that precedes or follows a phrase or a term, determining its meaning. See CASSON, *Textual Signposts*, 39.

⁴ Casson’s analysis assumes that the *dual-purpose* interpretation “points to the interdependence between Jews and Gentiles in God’s purposes, in particular to the dependence of the Gentiles on Christ’s ministry to the Jews”. CASSON, *Textual Signposts*, 251.

⁵ CASSON, *Textual Signposts*, 252. See also A. PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento (I libri biblici. Nuovo Testamento 6; Milano 2001) 487; J.A. FITZMYER, *Romans*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB; New York 1993) 706.

⁶ Casson discusses whether ὁμᾶς in v. 7b is referring to exclusively Gentile addressees or to both Gentile and Jewish addressees. Both interpretations (H and I) consider δέ as a conjunction. CASSON, *Textual Signposts*, 252-253 (the emphasis is mine).

understanding of the *dual-purpose* interpretation, and, in a sense, she makes the former dependent on the latter. However, interpreting v. 9a, some scholars have noted, first, the opposing δέ ⁷, and second, the harsh change of subjects ⁸. Focusing mainly on the analysis of γάρ, Casson overlooks *de facto* the γάρ-δέ construction and the syntactical problems raised by reading both infinitives 8b-9a as parallel.

II. A DUAL PURPOSE IN ROMANS 15,8-9

How should one understand the γάρ-δέ construction in Rom 15,8a-9a? What are the implications of reading βεβαιῶσαι and δοξάσαι as parallel? Does the syntax indicate an interruption in the flow of thought between the subjects “Christ” (διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς) and “the Gentiles” (δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν)? Unlike Casson, Lambrecht, for example, stresses the δέ-clause at the beginning of v. 9a and the opposition between the purposes introduced by the infinitives (βεβαιῶσαι and δοξάσαι). He claims that the two actions, Christ becoming servant of περιτομῆς and Christ “receiving the Gentiles” — a premise Lambrecht introduces into the text — are not the same ⁹.

Lambrecht assumes that the emphasis of vv. 7-13 lies on the Gentiles since Paul urges the “strong”, i.e., the Gentiles, in Rom 14,1 – 15,13 to welcome the “weak”. Even though in Rom 15,7 Paul exhorts both (προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους), “weak” and “strong”, to mutual welcome, Lambrecht argues that the idea of “glorifying God” in vv. 6-7a is seen as a final purpose, therefore “in v. 9a the Gentiles’ glorification of God is also considered an aim, a purpose” ¹⁰. He insists that “God’s mercy towards the Gentiles constitutes a main point of 15,1-13. It is the real ground of his exhortation to ‘the strong’. Because of that (almost unexpected) divine

⁷ “One should not neglect the oppositional δέ in v. 9a. The contrast, of course, is strengthened by the similar, but in terms of content, divergent expressions ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ in v. 8a and ὑπὲρ ἐλέους in v. 9a”: J. LAMBRECHT, “The Confirmation of the Promises: A Critical Note on Romans 15,8”, *ETHL* 78 (2002) 156-160, here 157.

⁸ Cranfield considers this change of subject as “a stylistic horror in Greek”: C.E.B. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh 1981) 743.

⁹ In addition to highlighting the oppositional δέ, Lambrecht affirms that both prepositional phrases (ὑπὲρ) — expressing purpose — corresponding to Christ’s action are divergent: “‘for the sake of truthfulness’ [ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας] differs from ‘for the sake of mercy’ [ὑπὲρ ἐλέους]”. J. LAMBRECHT, “Syntactical and Logical Remarks on Romans 15,8”, *NovT* 42 (2000) 257-261, here 259. See also J. LAMBRECHT, “The Confirmation of the Promises”, 157.

¹⁰ LAMBRECHT, “Syntactical and Logical Remarks”, 260.

mercy they, ‘the strong’, must be merciful to ‘the weak’”¹¹. However, to validate this emphasis, after the “interruptive addition” concerning the “promises given to the patriarchs” in v. 8b, Lambrecht must add an extra verbal action in v. 9a: *Christ* received (προσελάβετο) the Gentiles, and he also supplies an extra prepositional construction (εἰς τό): so that they glorify God.

Wagner has, similarly, suggested that Christ is the implied subject in v. 9a. Unlike Lambrecht, Wagner seeks to read vv. 8a-9a as a well-balanced structure. He must also add some extra information to v. 9a to clarify the syntax: Christ has become a servant with respect to the Gentiles, on behalf of the mercy of God, in order to glorify God. Wagner interprets the accusative τὰ ἔθνη as an accusative of respect. He notes the uncommon syntax of ὑπέρ + δοξάζειν¹², and therefore separates the prepositional phrase ὑπὲρ ἐλέους from the infinitive δοξάζειν¹³. Wagner claims that this reading must be considered better for its simplicity; it only supplies one repetition: διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι. Paul would have created a sentence that is syntactically and semantically balanced, stating a clear parallelism between περιτομή and τὰ ἔθνη, and between ἀλήθεια and ἔλεος. Thus, the claimed parallelism would underline Christ’s ministry to Jew and Gentile alike, as well as the motivations for Christ’s ministry (by means of the two ὑπέρ phrases). Yet, Wagner must clarify that God’s faithfulness to his promises and God’s merciful inclusion of the Gentiles are the real issues at stake, and that they are not obscured by Christ’s ministry¹⁴. Ultimately, as Pitta has suggested, Wagner’s alleged simplicity is more convoluted¹⁵.

Lambrecht reads δέ in v. 9a as an adversative particle, stressing a *single-purpose*: “so that the Gentiles may glorify God”. Casson¹⁶, Wagner, and

¹¹ LAMBRECHT, “The Confirmation of the Promises”, 159.

¹² Wagner’s research using the *TLG* shows no examples of ὑπέρ + δοξάζω “to express that for which praise is given”. However, he admits that Paul might have used such an uncommon syntax to create a balanced parallelism between the two ὑπέρ phrases: J.R. WAGNER, “The Christ, Servant of Jew and Gentile: A Fresh Approach to Romans 15:8-9”, *JBL* 116 (1997) 473-485, here 479, n. 30.

¹³ “In this reading of the sentence, δοξάζειν is subordinate to γεγενῆσθαι as an infinitive of purpose (thus parallel to the whole phrase εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι κτλ.). The ‘subject’ of the infinitive, however, is not τὰ ἔθνη but τὸν Χριστόν. The phrase ὑπὲρ ἐλέους modifies γεγενῆσθαι, in parallel with ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ, indicating the motivation for Christ’s becoming a servant to the Gentiles”: WAGNER, “The Christ, Servant of Jew and Gentile”, 482.

¹⁴ WAGNER, “The Christ, Servant of Jew and Gentile”, 483.

¹⁵ “L’ipotesi di chi considera Cristo come soggetto che glorifica Dio di fronte ai gentili è più contorta della stessa formulazione paolina, perché si tratterebbe di una ripetizione della successiva citazione diretta e perché, in definitiva, tale asserzione non rientra nella cristologia paolina”: PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*, 487. See also T. ENGBERG-PERDERSEN, *Paul and the Stoics* (Edinburgh 2000) 356-357, n. 29.

¹⁶ Casson’s study, however, does not review either Lambrecht’s or Wagner’s reading of the γάρ-δέ construction of vv. 8a-9a.

other scholars read the same *δέ* as a conjunctive particle, stating a *dual-purpose*. The *single-purpose* interpretation implies that both purposes are opposed, so only one — the second — remains, while the *dual-purpose* interpretation assumes that both purposes are parallel. On the other hand, the interpretation of vv. 8b-9a as two parallel purpose expressions¹⁷, either dependent on λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι in v. 8a or on εἰς τό in v. 8b¹⁸, focuses on Christ's action towards Jew and Gentile, but does not explain God's action, i.e., the theological rationale. Yet, analyzing the theological rationales proposed in the prepositional phrases (ὕπὲρ ἀληθείας and ὕπὲρ ἐλλέους)¹⁹, one may trace two consecutive stages of God's salvific plan, first towards the Jews and then towards the Gentiles (cf. Rom 1,16-17). The sequence of these rationales (vv. 8a-9a) also indicates that *δέ* in v. 9a might introduce an explanation (*that is*) of the foregoing expression in v. 8. Such a transitional meaning is not unknown in the NT²⁰.

III. CONCESSION OR PURPOSE IN ROM 15,8?

Söding's study about the fulfillment of the promises in Paul's theology reads Rom 15,8 as *Kernsatz* of the *recapitulatio* in Rom 15,1-13 and of the entire letter; Christ confirms the promises to the patriarchs, revealing the validity of these promises for the Gentiles, and fulfilling them beyond

¹⁷ "That the Gentiles are glorifying God is a result of Christ's ministry to the circumcised, but it is not part of God's righteousness (that is, faithfulness to the patriarchal promises); these are *parallel correlates* of the one work of Christ": T.L. DONALDSON, *Paul and the Gentiles*. Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World (Minneapolis, MN 1997) 99-100 (the emphasis is mine). See also B. BYRNE, *Romans* (Sacra Pagina 6; Collegeville, MN 1996) 431.

¹⁸ For the former, reading Christ as the main subject, becoming διάκονος of the circumcised and *with respect* to the Gentiles, see WAGNER, "The Christ, Servant of Jew and Gentile", 482. In a similar way, Cranfield reads δοξάσαι as dependent on λέγω, "indicating a present action ('I declare that ... but that the Gentiles are glorifying ...')": CRANFIELD, *Romans*, 742. See also U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT 6; Zürich 1978-82) 3:106. For the latter, reading the confirmation of the promises and the glorification by the Gentiles as further purposes of Christ becoming a servant, see D. MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 876-877. See also J.M.G. BARCLAY, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, MI 2015) 460, n. 25; R. JEWETT, *Romans*. A Commentary (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2007) 892-893.

¹⁹ The notions of ἔλεος and ἀλήθεια, found in both infinitival clauses, describe divine attributes not only in Romans but also in the OT. See ἔλεος as divine mercy in Rom 9,23; 11,31. See ἀλήθεια as divine attribute in Rom 1,25; 3,7. Psalm 84,11 describes, for example, a longing for union of both ἔλεος and ἀλήθεια. For Michel these two notions, taken together, stress the significance of the divine manifestation for Jews and Christians alike: O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK IV; Göttingen¹⁴1978) 448, n. 25.

²⁰ See BDAG s.v. *δέ*, 213. See, for example, Rom 3,22; 9,30; 1Cor 10,11; 15,56; Eph 5,32; Phil 2,8.

measure²¹. Lambrecht, however, disputes Söding's reading, arguing that the verb βεβαιῶσαι in v. 8b "does not appear to indicate the inclusion of the Gentiles nor does it point to a fulfillment of the promises 'beyond measure'"²². He bases this conclusion on his grammatical analysis of vv. 8a-9a and on his understanding of the promises.

Lambrecht attempts to solve the jarring change of subjects in Rom 15,8a-9a suggesting that the γάρ-δέ construction introduces a concession in which the real statement is expressed by the δέ clause²³. For Lambrecht v. 8 does not reflect Israel's role in the salvation of the Gentiles; vv. 8a-9a mainly focus on God's mercy towards the Gentiles. Therefore, his reading considers v. 8 as a concession: it is true — namely, we admit — that Christ became a servant of the circumcised to show God's faithfulness, "but in order to show his mercy Christ received the Gentiles so that they, too, may glorify God"²⁴. Other authors prefer to consider the confirmation of the promises (εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι) as parenthetical²⁵. However, looking into the reasoning of vv 7a-9a, the γάρ-δέ construction may convey a different meaning, without opposing the infinitival clauses, nor reading them as parallel.

The difference between εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι and δοξάζειν may be explained in the light of the syntactical distinction between purpose and result²⁶. The construction εἰς τὸ + infinitive may denote purpose (telic) or result (ecbatic)²⁷. But within the context of vv. 7a-9a, the infinitival clause "to

²¹ "‘Um die Verheißungen der Vater zu bekräftigen’, stirbt er diesen Tod, weil er sich so radikal ‘unter das Gesetz’ beugt (Gal 4.4), dass er auch die Heiden in den Raum der Gnade einbezieht; er bekräftigt die Verheißungen, indem er nicht nur offenbart, dass sie gelten, sondern indem er sie über die Maßen erfüllt": T. SÖDING, "Verheißung und Erfüllung im Lichte paulinischer Theologie", *NTS* 46 (2001) 146-170, here 167.

²² LAMBRECHT, "The Confirmation of the Promises", 157.

²³ "A final grammatical note concerns the γάρ ... δέ-construction of vv. 8a.9a. There could be a hidden μέν present in v. 8a. In such a construction the first clause is often somewhat concessive (= everybody knows that...). The real reason (γάρ) and the emphasis on it are to be found in the δέ-clause": LAMBRECHT, "The Confirmation of the Promises", 158.

²⁴ LAMBRECHT, "Syntactical and Logical Remarks", 260 (the emphasis is mine).

²⁵ See G. Saß, "Röm 15,7-13 als Summe des Römerbriefs gelesen", *EvTh* 53 (1993) 510-527, here 517-518. See also E. KÄSEMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT; Tübingen 41980) 372; L.E. KECK, "Christology, Soteriology, and the Praise of God (Romans 15:7-13)", *The Conversation Continues. Studies in Paul & John* (FS J. Louis Martyn) (eds. R.T. FORTNA – B.R. GAVENTA) (Nashville, TN 1990) 85-97, here 89.

²⁶ See BDF §402.2: "Εἰς τὸ is used to denote purpose or result, apparently not differing from τοῦ and the infinitive (§400); the former predominates in Paul (and Heb), the latter in Lk." See also H.B. SMYTH, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA 1956) §§2008, 2011. The infinitive of purpose appears in Rom 1,11; 4,11.16; 6,12; 11,11. The infinitive of result is found in Rom 1,20; 4,11; 12,3.

²⁷ See I.T. BECKWITH, "The Articular Infinitive with εἰς," *JBL* 15 (1896) 162-167. Beckwith analyzes seventy-two cases of εἰς τὸ with infinitive in the NT, distinguishing between purpose clauses and clauses of result. Discussing Beckwith's findings, Burk

confirm the promises to the patriarchs” (v. 8b) seems to reflect the intention of the verbal subject (Christ) rather than the consequence of his becoming servant of the circumcised²⁸. On the other hand, the infinitival clause “the Gentiles glorify God” (v. 9a) may express the final — theological — outcome of Christ’s ministry²⁹. In this sense, γάρ might introduce a long complex sentence, in which v. 8a constitutes a declarative sentence, followed by two dependent infinitival clauses: “to confirm (βεβαιῶσαι) the promises to the patriarchs” (v. 8b) and “to glorify (δοξάσαι) God” (v. 9a), both joined by a transitional δέ, indicating respectively purpose and result³⁰.

Interpreting the γάρ clause as a concessive clause in Rom 15,8a creates further problems for the understanding of the entire letter. If “Christ becomes servant of the circumcised”, one may think that the Gentiles must be circumcised, or at least, that they must observe some legal prescriptions (as a concession). Does Paul make a concession to the Christian-Jews not to lose their support in the community? Pitta explains that though there is no mention of νόμος (or ἐντολή) in this section (Rom 14,1 – 15,13), Paul has to deal with its discriminative elements, specifically the dietary and calendar observance issues (Rom 14,2-3.5-6). The Jewish law does not prevent the “weak” or the “strong” from despising or judging each other (cf. Rom 14,3.10). Yet, Paul’s understanding of νόμος in Romans neither repeals the law (of its final purpose: to be holy and to glorify God), nor makes a concession (of its normative force)³¹. Rather than a concession to the Christian-Jews, Paul’s declaration in Rom 15,8a may be interpreted as an introduction to his explanation of Christ’s welcoming and of its universal purpose (εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ) in v. 7b.

demonstrates that εἰς τό + infinitive frequently denotes purpose. D. BURK, *Articular Infinitives in the Greek of the New Testament*. On the Exegetical Benefit of Grammatical Precision (New Testament Monographs 14; Sheffield 2006) 99.

²⁸ Garroway, for example, redefines Christ’s ministry to the Jews and proposes to understand him as “a facilitator of circumcision, like a mohel”: J.D. GARROWAY, “The Circumcision of Christ: Romans 15.7-13”, *JSNT* 34 (2012) 303-322, here 306.

²⁹ Cf. A.A. DAS, “‘Praise the Lord, All you Gentiles’: The Encoded Audience of Romans 15.7-13”, *JSNT* 34 (2011) 90-110, here 105.

³⁰ The Gentiles can glorify God as a result of God’s faithfulness to God’s plan. The entire section thereby shows an *incrementum* that seeks to include the Gentiles in one unanimous praise. The scriptural proof in vv. 9b-12 confirms, in fact, this inclusive pattern.

³¹ “[Paolo] non presenta alcuna cognizione abrogativa della Legge, né di carattere concessivo: le dichiarazioni positive sul *nomos* sono reali e si spiegano nell’orizzonte dell’*adiaphoron* o dell’indifferenza che assume rispetto a Cristo”: A. PITTA, *Paolo, la Scrittura e la legge*. Antiche e nuove prospettive (CSB 57; Bologna 2008) 233. Pitta himself acknowledges that the debate regarding the function νόμος in Romans is a “mine-field”, a discussion that exceeds the present research.

Do the promises (τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων) in v. 8b include the salvation of the Gentiles? Lambrecht states that the significance of the promises in v. 8 cannot be over-emphasized; he believes that the plural “promises” hardly refer “to the single promise to Abraham”³². The promises describe God’s obvious faithfulness to the patriarchs, but they do not include a specific reference to Abraham, i.e., “that the Gentiles will be blessed in him”³³. Yet, Lambrecht himself acknowledges the weakness of his argument: “One could argue against our explanation of 15,8-9 by referring to 4,16 where Paul uses the same terminology and certainly means the ‘firm’ promise regarding the Gentiles”³⁴. He responds insisting that the promise in 4,16 and 9,6-18 is a “singular” promise, either to Abraham or to Israel. “Most probably the plural of 15,8, *though by itself inclusive*, also limits its attention to Israel’s privileges and in this verse does not pay attention to her universalist vocation”³⁵. One must note, however, that apart from underestimating the references to the universal scope of the promises to Israel in Rom 4,16 and 9,6-18, Lambrecht neglects the assertion of the universal salvation, “first to the Jew, then to the Gentile”, as it is stated in the *propositio* of Romans (1,16-17).

IV. THE PROMISES TO THE PATRIARCHS

The promises in Rom 15,8 are unlikely a concession to the patriarchs or to Paul’s audience. Yet, there is no scholarly consensus about the content of these promises. Some recent studies have discussed whether or not the expression εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων indicate the fulfillment of the incorporation of the Gentiles in God’s people. Whittle’s monograph, for example, illustrates how Paul reinterprets some passages (“covenant-renewal texts”) from Deuteronomy, Hosea, and Isaiah to describe Gentile inclusion in God’s New Covenant people³⁶.

Whittle reads Rom 15,7-13 in the light of the Deuteronomic narrative. In these verses Paul would have in mind the covenant blessing, which would be the expression of the climax of Israel’s history, and of the

³² “Considering the whole of vv. 8-9a, it is unlikely that the plural ‘the promises’ contains a specific reference to the single promise to Abraham, that in him the Gentiles will be blessed (Gen 12,3; cf. Gal 3,6-9)”: LAMBRECHT, “The Confirmation of the Promises”, 158.

³³ LAMBRECHT, “The Confirmation of the Promises”, 159.

³⁴ LAMBRECHT, “The Confirmation of the Promises”, 159.

³⁵ LAMBRECHT, “The Confirmation of the Promises”, 159 (the emphasis is mine).

³⁶ Whittle studies Paul’s language of the promise under three aspects: as one of the privileges of Israel, in relation to Abraham’s descendants, and as a gift of the Spirit. See S. WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal and the Consecration of the Gentiles in Romans* (MSSNTS 161; Cambridge 2015) 134-135.

solution to the law's curse. "Deuteronomy's promise to the fathers is that, beyond the curse of the exile, Israel once again be established as God's holy people. It may be that Paul's reference to the promise to the fathers (Romans 15:8) has this aspect of Deuteronomy in view" ³⁷. Whittle stresses the relationship between God's covenant with Abraham (Gen 12,1-3) and the covenant blessing in Deut 28,9: "God the Lord will establish you as his holy people, as he has sworn to your fathers (ὁμοσεὶν τοῖς πατράσιν σου)".

Whittle's association between Abraham's narrative and Deuteronomy's narrative is grounded on contextual considerations rather than textual ones. She acknowledges that the notion of ἐπαγγελία is prominent in Rom 4,16; 8,8-9 but not in Genesis. For Whittle, when God promises Abraham that he will become a great nation and be blessed, as well as become a blessing (Gen 12,2), and when God swears assuring Abraham's blessing, descendants, and land (Gen 22,16-18), God is foreseeing, through Abraham, a blessing to "all the nations of the earth" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, Gen 22,18). The covenant blessing is therefore the thematic link between both narratives. God's oath to the fathers (Deut 28,9) is fulfilled in the creation of a holy people, corresponding to both covenant traditions: patriarchal and Sinai. Paul, in turn, would have interpreted "the promises to Abraham of blessing for the nations through Deuteronomy's blessing of the reconstitution of a holy people" ³⁸.

The patriarchal and the Sinai covenants reflect God's faithfulness. But in Deuteronomy God's covenant faithfulness includes some conditions, i.e., the laws given at Horeb (Deut 4,31; 7,9.12; 8,18) and on the plains of Moab (Deut 29,12). However, the non-compliance with these laws leads to numerous curses. Israel's election takes place through the fathers, but Israel's nationhood, which Deuteronomy describes as consecration of Israel as a holy (λαὸς ἅγιος, Deut 7,6; 14,2.21; 26,19) and chosen people (λαὸς περιούσιος, Deut 7,6; 14,2; 26,18; cf. Exod 19,5.6), only takes place after the covenant curses (Deuteronomy 27). Whittle specifies that "after the pronouncement of the covenant curses, the promise of the covenant blessing follows" (cf. Deut 28,9) ³⁹, and adds her understanding of the Pauline interpretation of this blessing, citing Watson: "For Paul, it is the Christ-event that marks the turning-point between a history of death and the curse and a history of life and blessing" ⁴⁰. Yet, to demonstrate that

³⁷ WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal*, 146.

³⁸ WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal*, 146.

³⁹ WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal*, 145.

⁴⁰ See F. WATSON, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London 2004) 464. Cf. WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal*, 152, n. 82.

the Christ-event changes the curse-death pattern, Whittle must take a significant detour from Romans.

Whittle's interpretation of the promises to the fathers in Rom 15,8 is based on two debatable assumptions: the law's curse lies behind Rom 15,7-13, and the content of the promise is tantamount to the (patriarchal and Sinai) covenant. First, Rom 15,7-13 hardly conveys the idea of a curse. It is true that the Deuteronomic narrative might be an interpretative key to understand Galatian's formulation of the Christ's event⁴¹. It is also true that one might infer a blessing-curse-blessing pattern in Gal 3,6-14 associated with Abraham's blessing and the law's curse⁴². However, in Romans Paul defines the law in positive terms (Rom 7,12; cf. Rom 8,4,7), and connects the patriarchal promises (ἐπαγγελία, and not διαθήκη) with the righteousness of faith (τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως, Rom 4,11.13) prior to his circumcision (4,10)⁴³. The scriptural proof in Rom 4,3-8 demonstrates that Abraham's faith is reckoned as righteousness apart from works, and that this blessedness (ὁ μακαρισμός) is similar — *analogous* — to the blessedness of those to whom God does not reckon sin (Rom 4,8; cf. Ps 31,1-2a [LXX])⁴⁴. The pattern blessing-curse or curse-blessing is not present in Rom 4,1-17, nor elsewhere in the letter, and the inference of a similar pattern in Rom 15,8 has no basis.

Second, Whittle acknowledges that the idea that Paul "receives it [διαθήκη] as the privileged term for *the* pledge to Abraham and then feels the need to replace it with a more inclusive concept [ἐπαγγελία] is

⁴¹ In Romans, however, the covenant narrative is limited to the patriarchal covenant (namely Abraham) and is subordinated to the ἐπαγγελία in Paul's own narrative.

⁴² See Abraham's blessing in Gal 3,8-9 and 3,14a: ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. See the law's curse in the internal *gezerah shawah* of Gal 3,10.13. Paul cites Deut 27,26 (γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά) and introduces the expression ἐπικατάρατος in his second citation of Deut 21,23; thus, creating a link with the first citation and stressing the mortal effects of the law's curse. Cf. J.-N. ALETTI, "Galatians 3:10-14. Justification, Faith and Law", *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul*. Collected Essays: Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology (SubBi 43; Rome 2012) 237-260.

⁴³ Paul does not need to use the term διαθήκη in Romans 4 to validate his arguments before his Jewish audience. By utilizing the figure of Abraham — *before* the circumcision — Paul interprets Abraham's situation as an analogous situation to David's (as it is described in Psalm 31). Both, Gentile (like Abraham, before he had been circumcised) and Jewish (David after his sin), have equal need of divine justification, and διαθήκη does not distinguish them.

⁴⁴ "Il testo invocato, ricorrendo alla situazione di un uomo che è in grave peccato e conseguentemente non ha opere di cui possa menar vanto, mostra con chiarezza apodittica che quel che manca a Gn 15,6 può essere evinto dalle parole del salmo": P. BASTA, *Abraham in Romani 4. L'analogia dell'agire divino nella ricerca esegetica di Paolo* (AnBib 168; Roma 2007) 148-149 (emphasis in the original).

not supported by the evidence” [in the OT] ⁴⁵. She also clarifies that by means of this substitution “Paul avoids applying the term διαθήκη to the Gentiles” ⁴⁶. Yet, Whittle’s association of the patriarchal covenant with the Sinai covenant mostly depends on διαθήκη vocabulary. Besides, Paul does not avoid using the term διαθήκη just to prevent the identification between the divine justification and the covenant law, but to demonstrate that the divine ἐπαγγελία takes place prior to the sign of circumcision that Abraham received as “seal of the righteousness he had by faith” (τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως, Rom 4,11). As a result, Paul may affirm the inclusion of the Gentiles as recipients of God’s promises to Abraham: “For the promise [ἐπαγγελία] that Abraham would inherit the world did not come to him or to his descendants through the law but through the righteousness of faith” (διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως, Rom 4,13).

V. MUTUAL WELCOMING: WHO IS ὑμᾶς IN ROMANS 15,7-13?

Casson’s monograph includes a brief discussion about the identity of the addressees in Rom 15,7-13. The exegetical issue at stake regards the textual variants and the content of ὑμᾶς. Schlier, for example, doubts that ὑμᾶς is the original reading. Following Leenhardt who considers the ἡμᾶς “plus doxologique” ⁴⁷, Schlier believes that the shift to ἡμᾶς must be understood within the broad context of the doxology (see δόξα, δοξάζω along vv. 6-9) ⁴⁸.

The analysis of the external evidence shows that the reading ἡμᾶς (“us”) is attested in B D* P 048 104 614 629 1506 b r sa (see also Theodoret and Johannes Damascenus). The variant ὑμᾶς (“you” pl.) has better support in the ancient manuscripts; it is attested in ⳨ A C D¹ F G L Ψ 33 81 365 630 1175 1241 1505 1739 1881 lat sy bo (see also Origenes [in “*Interpretatio Latina*”], Ambrosiaster) ⁴⁹. The variant ἡμᾶς attested in the Codex Vaticanus and in the Claromontanus (corrected) may be due to a late recension or a transcriptional error. Although both manuscripts are

⁴⁵ WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal*, 148.

⁴⁶ WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal*, 148, n. 68. Discussing Berkley’s understanding of the substitution of ἐπαγγελία for διαθήκη in reference to the Abrahamic covenant of blessing, Whittle notes that Paul’s use of the term ἐπαγγελία — if it is an actual substitution — “is not straightforward”: WHITTLE, *Covenant Renewal*, 148, n. 67. See also T.W. BERKLEY, *From a Broken Covenant to Circumcision of the Heart*. Pauline Intertextual Exegesis in Romans 2:17-29 (Atlanta, GA 2000) 167, n. 18.

⁴⁷ F.J. LEENHARDT, *L’Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains* (CNT; Genève ³1995) 205, n. 2.

⁴⁸ H. SCHLIER, *Der Römerbrief* (HThK 6; Freiburg 1977) 424.

⁴⁹ Cf. Nestle-Aland 28th ed. See a full listing of support in JEWETT, *Romans*, 886, n. a.

ancient witnesses of Paul's Letters, they often reflect scribal or editorial modifications. On the other hand, the reading ὑμᾶς, as Metzger notes, "has superior and more diversified support than the reading ἡμᾶς"⁵⁰.

The study of the internal evidence indicates that the variant ὑμᾶς, as Metzger observes, "is in harmony with the other instances of the second person plural in the context (verses 5-7)"⁵¹. Cranfield notes that this reading is sharper since it includes the "weak" and the "strong"; "Christ has accepted both groups"⁵². The exhortation προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους in v. 7a confirms that Paul's reasoning is addressed to the aforementioned οἱ δυνατοί and ἀδύνατοι of v. 1. Therefore, Lambrecht's remark insisting that "after the inclusive verse 7 Paul distinguishes between Jews and Gentiles in vv. 8-12" appears not to be carefully weighed⁵³. Rather than opposing the recipients of Christ's ministry Paul seems to promote mutual welcoming and mutual praise. How then could one explain the reading ἡμᾶς on the basis of the internal evidence? The introduction of ἡμᾶς within this recapitulation, as Cranfield suggests, "may be explained as reflecting the usage of worship"⁵⁴.

Paul's reasoning in Rom 14,1 – 15,13 corroborates the identity of ὑμᾶς ("you" pl.) in which he includes both Jews and Gentiles. In 14,4.10 Paul apostrophes σύ ("you" sing.) to prevent him from judging and despising others. The *incrementum* in chapter 14 shows that, more than averting Christian believers from judging and despising "someone else", Paul builds the notion of ἀδελφός (14,10.13.15.21). First, relativizing the criteria for judging (κρίνω, 14,4-5.13), for instance, dietary issues and holiday observance, and then configurating a communal "we", Paul fosters mutual edification. The above-mentioned *incrementum* alternates persuasion and dissuasion. In effect, Paul seeks to dissuade the addressees from causing others to stumble in order to persuade his audience to welcome them as brothers, and to bear with their failings (15,1). The notion of ἀδελφός in Romans 14 is taken up by the notion of πλησίον in Rom 15,2. Thus, exhorting "you" to mutual welcoming in v. 7 may indeed include Jews and Gentiles regardless of their ethnical identity⁵⁵. The scriptural catena

⁵⁰ B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th Rev. Ed.)* (London 1994) 473.

⁵¹ METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 473.

⁵² CRANFIELD, *Romans*, 2:739.

⁵³ LAMBRECHT, "The Confirmation of the Promises", 159.

⁵⁴ CRANFIELD, *Romans*, 2:739.

⁵⁵ Cf. J.-N. ALETTI, "Romans 14:1–15:6. The Strong and the Weak", in *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul. Collected Essays: Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology* (Rome 2012) 173-190, here 190.

in vv. 9b-12 confirms such an inclusion, encouraging unanimous praise: Jew and Greek alike glorify God by the power of the Holy Spirit.

VI. AN ANTI-IMPERIAL CONSTRUAL?

Some scholars discuss the epistolary function of Rom 15,7-13. After examining three different alternatives, Gignac reads this passage as a conclusion of the entire letter⁵⁶. On the other hand, Cranfield considers the imperative “to welcome one another” in v. 7 to be the summary of the section (Rom 14,1 – 15,13)⁵⁷. Whether or not this unit promotes mutual welcoming is open to discussion. Wright, for example, reads the section in messianic terms. His analysis of the scriptural catena in vv. 9b-13 stresses the citation of Isa 11,10 (in v. 12), which would be the climax of Rom 14,1 – 15,13⁵⁸. Paul may have associated Rom 15,8-12 with Rom 1,3-4, creating an *inclusio*. These texts correlate Christ with the Davidic Messiah, especially Isa 11,10, which echoes Rom 1,4, identifying the resurrected Jesus as Messiah and Lord⁵⁹. For Wright, “the idea of a risen Messiah ‘ruling the nations’ is, moreover, packed with explosive political implications”⁶⁰. Some authors, however, have called into question this “anti-imperial” reading of the passage and of the whole letter⁶¹.

Barclay, for instance, has posed some pertinent questions about Wright’s understanding of the relationship between Paul and the Roman empire⁶². Barclay admits that the imperial cult pervaded the Mediterranean world (ca. 1 AD), but he clarifies that Paul shows little interest in the

⁵⁶ A. GIGNAC, *L’épître aux Romains* (CbNT 6; Paris 2014) 533-534. Gignac actually relies on Hays and Wright. Cf. R.B. HAYS, “Adam, Israel, Christ: The Question of Covenant in the Theology of Romans: A Response to Leander E. Keck and N.T. Wright”, in *Pauline Theology*. Vol. III: Romans (eds. D.M. HAY – E.E. JOHNSON) (SBLSymS 4; Minneapolis, MN 1995) 84.

⁵⁷ Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:739.

⁵⁸ “Rom. 15.8–12 (the summing up of the whole letter), quoting Ps. 18.49/2 Sam. 22.50; Dt. 32.43; Ps. 117.1; and, climactically, Isa. 11.10”: N.T. WRIGHT, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Vol. II (Minneapolis, MN 2013) 1455, n. 167. See also N.T. WRIGHT, “The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. X (eds. L.E. KECK et al.) (Nashville, TN 2002) 748.

⁵⁹ “Paul, we may suppose, has had this verse of Isaiah in mind throughout the whole letter, waiting to produce it as the final move in his entire argument”: WRIGHT, “Romans: Introduction, Commentary”, 748.

⁶⁰ WRIGHT, “Romans: Introduction, Commentary”, 748.

⁶¹ Casson, for example, underlines that “an anti-imperial interpretation of the letter’s purpose and argument [...] is not confirmed by the procedural analysis of 15:7–13”: CASSON, *Textual Signposts*, 263.

⁶² J.M.G. BARCLAY, “Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant for Paul”, in *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (WUNT 275; Tübingen 2011) 363-387.

former, since no explicit reference to it can be found in his letters. Paul names different forms of idolatry without associating them with the Roman deities. Barclay doubts that Paul's "political" vocabulary might have implied an antithetical relationship between the church and the Roman empire. In this sense, Wright underscores what the Pauline churches must have heard in Paul's letters, without taking sufficient account of the rhetorical and literary contexts of the letters as a whole. Barclay mentions, for example, 1 Cor 8,4-6 and Phil 2,11 as texts including "political" language that scarcely allows the reader to identify "Caesar's claim as of particular significance or threat" ⁶³. Wright himself, however, acknowledges that he detects some "echoes of Caesar" throughout the Pauline text, but none of these is explicit ⁶⁴. Barclay adds that tracing a "hidden transcript" or hidden code is unconvincing ⁶⁵. Paul's "political" vocabulary (ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις, βασιλεύω, etc.) may include Roman power but has a larger scope referring to more significant powers. In comparison to Paul's understanding of power, the imperial cult and the Roman empire are insignificant ⁶⁶.

Wright has responded to Barclay's objections in a long chapter ("The Lion and the Eagle: Paul in Caesar's Empire") of *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, attempting to clarify the "significance" Caesar had in Paul's gospel. Wright argues that the "coded critique" is part of the cryptic and oblique Pauline procedure in his letters ⁶⁷. Although Barclay reduces "the claims of the imperial cult and of the Roman empire to comparative insignificance" ⁶⁸, Wright believes that this admission means, on the

⁶³ BARCLAY, "Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant for Paul", 379. Casson closely follows Barclay in questioning this "anti-imperial interpretation of the letter's purpose": CASSON, *Textual Signposts*, 263.

⁶⁴ See BARCLAY, "Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant for Paul", 370, n. 26. Following Hays's procedure for detecting "echoes of Scripture in Paul", Wright identifies "echoes of Caesar" in Paul's letters. See N.T. WRIGHT, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis, MN 2005) 61. Cf. R. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT 1989).

⁶⁵ The notion comes from J.C. SCOTT, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven, CT 1990). See also R.A. HORSLEY, ed., *Hidden Transcripts and the Arts of Resistance: Applying the Work of James C. Scott to Jesus and Paul* (Semeia Studies 48; Atlanta, GA 2004).

⁶⁶ "The Roman empire was insignificant to Paul precisely because his peculiar epistemology placed politics on this wider and more complex stage; to interpret him otherwise is not only to reduce and misshape his theology, but to abandon a precious tool of analysis drawn from his distinctive theopolitics": BARCLAY, "Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant for Paul", 387.

⁶⁷ "That bring us back again to the nature of coded critique, which Barclay is so good at recognizing in Josephus but so unwilling to recognize in Paul": WRIGHT, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 1314-1315.

⁶⁸ BARCLAY, "Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant for Paul", 387.

contrary, that the Roman empire was not insignificant to Paul ⁶⁹. In relation to his association of the messianic interpretation of Rom 1,3-17 // 15,7-13 with the echoes of the Roman imperial ideology ⁷⁰, one should note, however, that Wright's response to Barclay, *sensu stricto*, neither explains the messianic reading of Rom 15,12 nor justifies the function of Isa 11,10 within the scriptural sequence.

VII. THE SCRIPTURAL CATENA

Wright's interpretation of Rom 15,12 suggests that the mention of the "root of Jesse [...] who rises to rule the Gentiles" has political implications. This reading of Isa 11,10, however, isolates it from the scriptural catena, obscuring its function within the sequence. Some authors have, instead, read the catena of citations as focusing exclusively on the repetition of the expression τὰ ἔθνη. Gignac, for example, proposes that the passage be interpreted as an example of a *gezerah shawah*: "Selon une technique exégétique déjà rencontrée en Rm 9–11 et qui sera ultérieurement codifiée dans les règles rabbiniques (*gezerah shawah*), le florilège assemble quatre citations qui ont en commun le mot «nations»" ⁷¹. Whether the citations might be interpreted in the light of a single textual repetition and whether or not they function as a scriptural proof may be clarified by paying attention to the argumentative *incrementum* of the unit.

The expression τὰ ἔθνη appears in all four OT citations found in Rom 15,9b-12 ⁷². This repetition might corroborate the understanding of those who read the passage in the light of the rabbinic rules (*middot*) of interpretation. However, the second (Deut 32,43) and third (Ps 117,1) citations also include the term λαός // οἱ λαοί, creating a further aural effect. In Deut 32,43c λαός probably alludes to Israel (in parallel with υἱοὶ θεοῦ, v. 43b; see also Deut 32,36). And in Ps 117,1 the plural

⁶⁹ In his recent *Paul and the Gift*, however, Barclay has declared once again his skepticism: "Wright has yet to offer a convincing explanation for Paul's supposedly coded criticisms of Rome in letters directed to Christian believers": J.M.G. BARCLAY, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, MI 2017) 456, n. 15.

⁷⁰ BARCLAY, "Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant for Paul", 368.

⁷¹ "Elles sont tirées des trois parties de la Bible juive (TaNaK): Torah (Dt 32,43), Neviim/prophètes (Is 11,10) et Ketouvim/Écrits (Ps 17,50 LXX, Ps 116, LXX)": GIGNAC, *L'épître aux Romains*, 537.

⁷² For a complete analysis of the scriptural citations and the Pauline modifications, see C.D. STANLEY, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge 1992) 179-183. Stanley discusses here many of the previous results of Koch's research. Cf. D.-A. KOCH, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus (BHT 69; Tübingen 1986) 87-88, 109, 241-242.

οἱ λαοί does not seem to exclusively designate Israel; the expression appears to be a synonym of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Thus, the expressions τὰ ἔθνη and οἱ λαοί are intertwined, forming an inclusive pattern. The verbal shift between the first-person singular (ἐξομολογήσομαι, v. 9b), the second-person plural (εὐφράνθητε, αἰνεῖτε, vv. 10.11a), and the third-person plural and singular (ἐπαινεσάτωσαν, v. 11b, ἔσται, ἐλπιούσιν, v. 12) confirms the same pattern. The terms ἐλπίζω and ἐλπίς (vv. 12-13) further amplify Paul's understanding of the unanimous praise. Gentiles and Israel praise together because the God of hope is the one who fills (πληρώσαι) you (ὁμᾶς) with all joy and peace (v. 13a).

Whether Paul uses a rabbinic rule of interpretation in Rom 15,9b-12 is debatable. Some authors have demonstrated that Paul's use of some techniques is closely related to Hillel's *middot* ⁷³, for example in Rom 4,3-8 ⁷⁴. However, the presence of a particular *middah* in Rom 15,9b-12 is not obvious. First, Paul may not have known Hillel's rules as such, nor those of Rabbi Ishmael. The *middot* as they are found in the Tannaitic period reflect a more elaborated process of interpretation ⁷⁵. Second, some authors have clarified that the use of these *middot* — during the Tannaitic period — was restricted to the interpretation of legal texts ⁷⁶, i.e., limited to halakhic issues. So, these rules of interpretation might not be suitable for reading non-legal texts ⁷⁷. These remarks, however, do not exclude the possibility of interpreting Rom 15,9b-12 in the light of a different rabbinic technique ⁷⁸, not halakhic but haggadic ⁷⁹.

⁷³ The bibliography about "Paul and the rabbinical rules of interpretation" is immense. For a complete recent survey, see E. GONZÁLEZ MARTÍNEZ, *La salvación escatológica de Israel en Romanos 11,25-27: Estudio de la cita de Isaías 59,20-21 + 27,9 en la literatura bíblica y parabólica* (ABE.tesis 72; Estella 2019) 26-28, 40-50.

⁷⁴ P. BASTA, *Gezerah Shawah*. Storia, forme e metodi dell'analisi biblica (SubBi 26; Roma 2006); see also BASTA, *Abramo in Romani 4*, 117-182.

⁷⁵ Cf. M. CHERNICK, "Internal Restraints on Gezerah Shawah's Application", *JQR* 80 (1990) 253-282; W.S. TOWNER, "Hermeneutical Systems of Hillel and the Tannaim: A Fresh Look", *HUCA* 53 (1982) 101-135.

⁷⁶ See, for example, Num 9,6-14; 2 Chr 30,1-3 and Sifre Num 69,2. Cf. BASTA, *Abramo in Romani 4*, 127-129; IDEM, *Gezerah Shawah*, 58-59.

⁷⁷ For the difference between Halakah and Haggadah, and for the use of the *middot* in the Midrashic literature, see also A. LUZZATO, *Leggere il Midrash*. Le interpretazioni ebraiche della Bibbia (Brescia 1999) 54-56, 57-60.

⁷⁸ In a recent publication I suggested that Rom 15,7-13 can be read as an example of Hillel's seventh rule: *kayose bo mimaqom 'aher*. See, J.M. GRANADOS, *Why Do You Judge Your Brother? The Rhetorical Function of Apostrophizing in Rom 14:1-15:13* (AnBibSt 15; Rome 2020) 158. However, I must admit that the articulation of the scriptural citations here may not correspond to Hillel's rule, but to a more flexible rabbinical use, perhaps closer to the homiletic *midrashim*.

⁷⁹ The suggestion can be inferred from Windfuhr's study; although he distinguishes between quoting and stringing together OT texts. "Der Unterschied zwischen Zitieren

In comparing Paul's and rabbinical exegesis, Bonsirven's analysis of Rom 15,9b-12 identifies a series of OT texts that are combined with great freedom and articulated as a sort of *ḥaraz* ⁸⁰. He notes, along with Bacher ⁸¹, that by "stringing together" a series of texts of the scripture — namely texts from the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Writings — ancient rabbis would enrich their homiletical commentaries ⁸². It is true that Rom 15,9b-12 includes citations from the three main sections of the OT. However, they do not follow *sensu stricto* a homiletical pattern, since the sequence does not open with a citation from the Torah ⁸³. Yet, one may trace here a similar practice to the homiletic *midrashim*. The form of the sequence is articulated by means of lexical repetitions (τὰ ἔθνη and οἱ λαοί) while the content of the sequence is determined by an inclusive (liturgical) pattern: τὰ ἔθνη together with Israel praise God. This *incrementum* built by the scriptural catena (*ḥaraz*) may reflect a haggadic procedure, which may be *sensu lato* similar to the homiletic *midrashim*. Paul would invoke not a single scripture citation but a well-crafted *ḥaraz* as a proof to confirm his previous statement of vv. 7-9a: the promises to the patriarchs lead the human family to praise God.

CONCLUSION

Paul's exhortation to "welcome one another" in Rom 15,7a is grounded upon a series of rationales in vv. 7b-13, which are set out in an inclusive pattern. However, understanding how Paul articulates Christological, theological, and scriptural motifs still raises questions among scholars. Some of them isolate the "promises to the patriarchs" as a sort of concession; others read the scriptural catena as an example of *gezerah shawah*. Recent studies have attempted to explain the series of purposes that

und ‚Perlenaufreihen‘ läßt sich übrigens sehr gut erkennen in Rm 9, dem Kapitel von der Gnadenwahl": D. WINDFUHR, "Der Apostel Paul als Haggadist", ZAW 44 (1926) 327-330, here 329.

⁸⁰ "Des rabbins on disait qu'ils enchaînaient [*hôrezîn*] des textes [...], soit pour commenter un texte du Pentateuque, soit pour enrichir leurs commentaires homilétiques": J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne* (BTH; Paris 1939) 336.

⁸¹ W. BACHER, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*. 2 vols (Leipzig 1905) 1:65.

⁸² "That process is known as *ḥaruzin*, a word which means basically 'stringing pearls' or 'beads'. *Haruzin* is the basic method of every homily": J.W. BOWKER, "Speech in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form", NTS 14 (1967) 96-111, here 100.

⁸³ "The apostle never introduces his *ḥaraz* in the explicit rabbinical manner": E.E. ELLIS, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI 1991) 49-50; cf. JEWETT, *Romans*, 893.

amplify Paul's exhortation. Casson's monograph, for example, has demonstrated the importance of the interpretation of γάρ in Rom 15,8; our study delves into the correlated subjects: the γάρ-δέ construction in vv. 8a-9a, the anti-imperial reading, and the inner coherence of the scriptural catena within vv. 7b-12. The complex sentence in vv. 8a-9a amplifies the Christological rationale ("as Christ has welcomed you" [pl.]) and its theological purpose ("for the glory of God"). This amplification — argumentative *incrementum* — takes place in two complementary stages. The Christological motivation is intertwined with the theological one, disclosing Christ's purpose for Israel, i.e., to confirm God's promises to the patriarchs. Additionally, "for the glory of God" includes the result of Christ's action for the Gentiles, i.e., unanimous praise. The scriptural catena (*ḥaraz*) following in vv. 9b-12 confirms the common purpose of praising God, and also explains Paul's own comprehension of such unanimity. For Paul, the climax of Israel's hope, i.e., the Gentiles joining Israel in praising the God of Israel, must be read in Christological terms. However, his reading of the Scriptures suggests that in Christ the Gentiles do not merely unite with Israel to praise the one true God, but they, together with Israel, constitute a "communal we" called to mutual edification and to glorification of God with one voice.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Piazza della Pilotta 35
I-00187 Rome

Juan Manuel GRANADOS

SUMMARY

Casson's recent monograph has brought to attention the importance of the interpretation of γάρ in Rom 15,8. This paper delves into the correlated subjects: the γάρ-δέ construction in vv. 8a-9a, the anti-imperial reading, and the inner coherence of the scriptural catena within vv. 7b-12. The syntax of the prepositional construction (εἰς τό + infinitive) in v. 8b and the infinitive verbs (βεβαιῶσαι and δοξάζσαι) in vv. 8b-9a do not indicate an interruption in the flow of thought between the subjects "Christ" and "the Gentiles", but an argumentative *incrementum* that articulates proofs and purposes.

SAME SOUND, BETTER READING? A TEXT-CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE 1 COR 15,49 VARIANTS

Of all the variant units in 1 Corinthians 15, the one that has engendered the most disagreement in modern text-critical analysis is the main verb of the second clause of v. 49. Was the earliest recoverable reading φορέσομεν (commonly understood as aorist hortatory subjunctive “let us wear”) or φορέσονται (future indicative “we will wear”)? Both NA²⁸ and UBS⁵ accept the second reading as more likely and the vast majority of scholars and translations agree ¹. However, as I show in detail below, the first reading has better attestation and some scholars have argued against what they regard as the overconfident conclusions of NA and UBS (UBS³ gave this minority reading a C rating while UBS⁵ gives it a B rating) ². Indeed, the two in-depth articles written on this textual variation

¹ For arguments, see P.J. BROWN, *Bodily Resurrection and Ethics in 1 Cor 15* (WUNT II/360; Tübingen 2014) 218; C.C. CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament. Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Grand Rapids, MI 2006) 544-545; D.E. GARLAND, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2003) 738; R.C.H. LENSKI, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis, MN 1963) 729; B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart ²1994) 502; A. ROBERTSON – A. PLUMMER, *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh ²1914) 375; E.J. SCHNABEL, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (HTA; Wuppertal 2006) 957; W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Band 4 (1 Kor. 15,1-16,24) (EKK 7/4; Düsseldorf – Neukirchen-Vluyn 2001) 312-313; A.C. THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2000) 1288-1289; W. VERBURG, *Endzeit und Entschlafene. Syntaktisch-sigmatische, semantische und pragmatische Analyse von 1 Kor 15* (FzB 78; Würzburg 1996) 216-218; D. ZELLER, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK 5; Göttingen 2010) 505.

² S. BRODEUR, *The Holy Spirit's Agency in the Resurrection of the Dead. An Exegetico-Theological Study of 1 Corinthians 15:44b-49 and Romans 8:9-13* (TGST 14; Rome 2004) 140-141; R.F. COLLINS, *First Corinthians* (SacPag 7; Collegeville, MN 1999) 572; A. ERIKSSON, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof. Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (CB.NT 29; Stockholm 1998) 271; G.D. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (rev. ed.; NIC.NT; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2014) 871 n. 324, 880; P. GARDNER, *1 Corinthians* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2018) 716-717; C. JANSSEN, *Anders ist die Schönheit der Körper. Paulus und die Auferstehung in 1 Kor 15* (Gütersloh 2005) 219-224; B.J. OROPEZA, *1 Corinthians* (NCCS; Eugene, OR 2017) 218; R.J. SIDER, “The Pauline Conception of the Resurrection Body in 1 Corinthians XV.35-54”, *NTS* 21 (1974-1975) 428-439, here 434. Earlier works that advocated for this reading include E.-B. ALLO, *Saint Paul: Première Épitre aux Corinthiens* (Paris ²1956) 429-430; F.W. GROSHEIDE, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1953) 379, 389; J. HÉRING, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (trans. A.W. HEATHCOTE – P.J. ALLCOCK) (London 1962) 179-180. English translations that favor this reading include DRA, EHV,

have both argued for the first reading ³. I aim to offer a similarly in-depth defense of the $\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ reading. My argument is that $\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ is the earliest recoverable reading because it best explains the alternative vowel reading, which may be in different cases a moralized reading (as in most patristic sources), a spelling mistake, or — according to Chrys Caragounis's often-overlooked proposal — an alternate spelling of the future indicative, rather than an aorist subjunctive ⁴.

I make this argument in three stages. First, I evaluate the arguments and criteria that scholars supporting the $\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ reading appeal to, in the process demonstrating the weakness of the arguments, despite the strength of the manuscript evidence. Second, I present my case that scholars are generally mistaken to think that the choice between these two readings is as simple as one between two different tenses and moods, when there are other possible explanations. Third, I demonstrate the failure of the advocates of the $\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ reading to show that this reading satisfies the most decisive text-critical criterion of the best reading/best explanation, while also arguing that the $\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ reading satisfies this criterion via a multi-faceted explanation that explains not only the alternative spelling but also the different senses which that reading could have.

I. EVALUATING ARGUMENTS FOR THE $\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ READING

Argument 1: External Criteria

The most obvious argument in favor of the ω reading is that all the external criteria favor it ⁵. It has the greatest quantity of attestation, even without taking the Majority Text into account, the oldest available testimony in its favor (\mathfrak{P}^{46} and, presumably, Marcion) ⁶, and the greatest distribution of witnesses by geography and quality. In addition to the vast majority of Byzantine texts, its witnesses include one papyrus, nine uncials/majuscules

MSG, MOUNCE, NET, and WEB. M. QUESNEL (*La première épître aux Corinthiens* [Commentaire biblique: Nouveau Testament 7; Paris 2018] 403) seems non-committal, but he at least entertains the possibility of this reading.

³ S.P. BOTH, "1 Korintiërs 15:49b: 'n Hortatief- of futurumlesing?," *HTS* 49 (1993) 760-774; S. SZYMIK, "Text-kristische und exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung zu 1 Kor 15,49," *Roczniki Teologiczne* 52 (2005) 117-133.

⁴ CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 546-564.

⁵ For the most extensive presentation of this argument, see SZYMIK, "Text-kristische", 118-122, 128-129.

⁶ For Marcion, see J.J. CLABEAUX, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul. A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion* (CBQ.MS 21; Washington, DC 1989) 53, 93-94, 156.

(\aleph , A, C, D, F, G, Ψ , 075, 0243), at least twenty-eight minuscules (33, 81, 104, 256, 263, 326, 330, 365, 436, 451, 459, 614, 629, 1175, 1241, 1319, 1573, 1739, 1877, 1912, 1962, 1984, 1985, 2127, 2200, 2464, 2492, 2495), the majority of lectionary texts, ten Old Latin texts, the Vulgate, the Bohairic Coptic text, the Gothic text, and dozens of references among the Church Fathers (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.9.3; 5.11.2; Tertullian, *Res.* 49; *Marc.* 5.10; Origen, *Fr. 1 Cor.* 13⁷; *Comm. Jo.* 2.47; 20.228-236; *Comm. Rom.* 9,1; *Cels.* 5.19; *Hom. Gen.* 9.2; 13.4; *Sel. Pss.* 2.1-2⁸; *Hom. Jer.* 2.1⁹; *Hom. Luke* 39.6¹⁰; Cyprian, *Test.* 2.10; 3.11; *Hab. virg.* 23; Didymus of Alexandria, *Comm. Zach.* 2.340¹¹; Methodius, *Res.* 2.18.5¹²; Hilary of Poitiers, *Tract. Ps. 118* 12.4¹³; *Tract. Pss.* 134.21¹⁴; Basil, *Eun.* 4¹⁵; Priscillian, *Apol.* 1¹⁶; 6¹⁷; 10¹⁸; Pacian, *Bapt.* 6; Gregory of Nyssa, *In illud*¹⁹; Ambrose, *Fid. Grat.* 5.14; *Exp. Ps. 118* 12.12²⁰; Ambrosiaster, *Comm. 1 Cor.* 15,49; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 70.3; John Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 42.2; Jerome, *Comm. Jer.* 1.12²¹; Augustine, *Mor. eccl.* 19.36; *Faust.* 2.4; *Exp. Ps.* 60.2; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 23.11; Cyril of Alexandria, *Fr. Rom.* 8,29; *Comm. 1 Cor.* 15,49; *Comm. Heb.* 3,1-2; *Thes. Trin.* 33²²; *Or. Theod.* 20²³; *Fid. Aug.* 5²⁴; *Nest.* 3.2²⁵; John of Damascus [dub.], *Sacr. pars.*²⁶; Photius, *Fr. 1 Cor.* 15,49)²⁷.

The o reading receives witnesses from six uncials/majuscules (B, I, 049, 056, 0142, 0150), at least fifteen minuscules (5, 6, 38, 88, 206, 218, 242, 630, 876, 915, 919, 1149, 1852^{vid}, 1872, 1881), and six lectionary texts (*l* 60, *l* 617, *l* 938, *l* 1364, *l* 1365, *l* 1441). The Syriac text, the Sahidic

⁷ C. JENKINS, "Origen on I Corinthians", *JThS* 9 (1907-1908) 231-247, 353-372, 500-514, here 242.

⁸ PG 15:1401-1404.

⁹ SC 232:240.

¹⁰ GCS 49:219-221.

¹¹ SC 84:596.

¹² GCS 27:369.

¹³ CSEL 21:458-459.

¹⁴ CSEL 21:708.

¹⁵ PG 29:700.

¹⁶ CSEL 18:19.

¹⁷ CSEL 18:72.

¹⁸ CSEL 18:98.

¹⁹ PG 44:1312.

²⁰ CSEL 62:257.

²¹ CChr.SL 74:12.

²² PG 75:569; cf. *ACO* 1,1,7:99.

²³ *ACO* 1,1,1:55.

²⁴ *ACO* 1,1,5:28.

²⁵ *ACO* 1,1,6:60.

²⁶ PG 95:1181.

²⁷ K. STAAB (ed.), *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Münster ²1984) 581.

Coptic text, and the Ethiopian text also favor it. Furthermore, it appears in several references among the Church Fathers (Clement of Alexandria, *Exc.* 15; Aphrahat, *Dem.* 6.18; Didymus of Alexandria, *Comm. Zach.* 2.339²⁸; *In Gen.* 3:19²⁹; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 102.11; Theodoret, *Comm. 1 Cor.* 15,49; Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Jo.* 9.1; 11.2; *Inc.*³⁰; *Quod unus sit Christus*³¹; *Glaph.* 1.1.5³²; *Comm. Luke* 10,23 [Sermon 67]³³; *Or. Reg.* 134³⁴; Gennadius of Constantinople, *Fr. Rom.* 5,12-14³⁵; Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Top.* 7.30, 34³⁶; Photius, *Fr. 1 Cor.* 15,49³⁷; Pseudo-Oecumenius, *Comm. 1 Cor.* 15,49³⁸; Theophylact, *Comm. 1 Cor.* 15,49).

The ω reading has the only papyrus witness and two other witnesses from the second century, namely Marcion (as implied by Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.10) and Irenaeus (assuming the accuracy of the Latin translation of *Haer.* 5.9.3; 5.11.2). Stefan Szymik especially stresses the testimony of Origen, who uses the ω spelling in every case in which he cites this text³⁹. This reading also dominates the testimony from every other century of manuscripts. The \omicron reading is of no small account in this regard, as Clement of Alexandria — and Theodotus, whom he is excerpting — may provide testimony from the late second century in *Exc.* 15, but Clement also provides indirect testimony to an aorist understanding of 1 Cor 15,49 in an aorist participle in the allusion to this text in *Ecl.* 24. It was also established well enough and early enough to be at least the majority Syriac reading⁴⁰. But there is no question that the majority of the earliest references feature the ω reading.

The ω reading also dominates in all categories of Alexandrian, “Western”, and Byzantine manuscripts, as well as manuscripts that present mixed or otherwise independent readings. It also dominates in the number and variety of representatives among the early versions of the Old Latin, Vulgate, Bohairic Coptic, and Gothic. Particularly notable high-quality

²⁸ SC 84:594.

²⁹ SC 233:244, 246.

³⁰ SC 97:232.

³¹ SC 97:330, 336.

³² PG 69:29.

³³ PG 72:673.

³⁴ ACO 1,1,5:95.

³⁵ STAAB, *Pauluskommentare*, 364.

³⁶ SC 197:87, 91.

³⁷ STAAB, *Pauluskommentare*, 581.

³⁸ PG 118:888.

³⁹ SZYMIK, “Text-kritische”, 121.

⁴⁰ B. ALAND — A. JUCKEL (eds.), *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, Vol. 2, Part 1 (ANTF 14; Berlin 1991) 485. They note later in their Greek translation of the Harklean version that the spelling here is questionable (597).

witnesses include α , A, C, 33, 81, and Origen. The ω reading also has a variety of testimony among Alexandrian, Byzantine, and mixed or otherwise independent texts. Its representatives among the early versions are the dominant readings of Syriac, Sahidic Coptic, and Ethiopic. Particularly notable high-quality witnesses include B, I, 6, 1881, and Theodoret. As such, the ω reading is superior on all of these counts of external evidence.

Argument 2: The Most Difficult Reading

The second argument, which tends to be the most significant factor for advocates of the ω reading, is that the ω reading, presumed to be an aorist hortatory subjunctive, represents the more difficult reading⁴¹. Indeed, it is for this same reason that the scholars who favor the majority view reject the ω reading. Bruce Metzger is typical in this regard: “Exegetical considerations (i.e., the context is didactic, not hortatory) led the Committee to prefer the future indicative, despite its rather slender external support”⁴². An exhortation does not as obviously fit the rhetorical context that is otherwise oriented to teaching about the future. Scott Brodeur further accentuates the point: “If the future were original, however, it would be very difficult to explain why a scribe would have changed it to the subjunctive and that this mistake should have caught on, only to become the overwhelmingly predominant reading”⁴³. Perhaps this contextual factor makes it more difficult to explain why scribes would overwhelmingly accept the ω reading rather than change it, unless the more difficult reading was the earliest and best established one.

Argument 3: Contextual Fit

The third argument, which operates in tension with the second argument, is that the ω reading, taken as a hortatory subjunctive, actually fits in this rhetorical context as well as the α reading because it is in keeping with Paul’s general style of argumentation. In Ronald Sider’s analysis, this reading fits because he interprets the larger section of which it is a part in a primarily ethical fashion⁴⁴. Raymond Collins claims: “[t]he

⁴¹ ALLO, *Corinthiens*, 429-430; BOTHA, “1 Korintiërs 15:49b”, 761; BRODEUR, *Holy Spirit’s Agency*, 141; COLLINS, *First Corinthians*, 572; ERIKSSON, *Traditions*, 271; FEE, *Corinthians*, 871 n. 324; GARDNER, *1 Corinthians*, 716; JANSSEN, *Anders*, 219; SZYMIK, “Text-kritische”, 125-128.

⁴² METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 502.

⁴³ BRODEUR, *Holy Spirit’s Agency*, 141.

⁴⁴ SIDER, “Pauline Conception”, 434.

rhetorical analysis of ch. 15 shows, moreover, that Paul concludes each of his proofs (vv. 34, 49) and his peroration (v. 58) with an exhortation”⁴⁵. Stefan Szymik, who authored one of the two most extensive defenses of this reading, suggests parallel notions to presently wearing the image of Christ in the rest of the Pauline corpus, such as Rom 8,29; 2 Cor 3,18; Gal 3,27; and Col 3,10⁴⁶. S.P. Botha, who authored the other most extensive defense of this reading, argues that the presence of a hortatory statement here would be parallel to the hortatory statements of Romans 6 following the didactic statements of Rom 5,12-21, and it fits with Paul’s switch to the first-person reference also meaning a switch from a less didactic tone to a more personal one in which he identifies with his readers⁴⁷.

Evaluation

The first argument does indeed assemble an impressive array of witnesses, but the minority reading has its own list of witnesses that is impressive for a minority reading. Particularly when one considers that the difference is between two vowels that were pronounced the same and that both spellings are recognizable Greek verb forms, the manuscript evidence is hardly a decisive factor⁴⁸. The texts linked to Alexandria among both manuscripts and Church Fathers are divided, as are the texts linked to Byzantium and the Coptic witnesses. The far southern and eastern witnesses favor the *o* reading while the far northern and western witnesses favor the *ω* reading. The most extensively unified witness in favor of the *ω* reading is that of texts connected to Rome and other Latin witnesses. After all, the difference in spelling between a future indicative and a (present) subjunctive in Latin is much more pronounced — *portabimus* vs. *portemus* — thus indicating that the Latin witnesses had manuscripts with the *ω* spelling and that the spelling signified, at least to them, a hortatory subjunctive (Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.10 is particularly clear about this distinction). Because they are doubly indirect witnesses — testimonies in another language of what a manuscript read by a patristic author or his forebearer might have contained — I do not intend to interact with the Latin witness extensively here, but it is notable that although Augustine consistently uses the *portemus* spelling (*Mor. eccl.* 19.36; *Faust.* 2.4;

⁴⁵ COLLINS, *First Corinthians*, 572. Cf. charts in BOTHA, “1 Korintiërs 15:49b”, 764-771.

⁴⁶ SZYMIK, “Text-kritische”, 130-131.

⁴⁷ BOTHA, “1 Korintiërs 15:49b”, 771-772.

⁴⁸ On this type of orthographical variance, see CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 475-517, 538-547.

Exp. Ps. 60.2), in *Trin.* 14.18.24 the context is clearly oriented towards the future, despite the use of a present subjunctive. However, this appears to be a rare exception in the Latin tradition ⁴⁹.

A further complication in the evidence is the conflicting manuscript traditions of the patristic authors. Szymik notes the example of Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 102.11, as a text which contains different spellings in different manuscripts ⁵⁰. However, there are several other examples that Szymik does not note. One of the earliest references in Clement of Alexandria's *Exc.* 15 features one reading or the other, without a context that clearly allows one to decide between the two ⁵¹. Given the spiritual sense that Theodotus gives to the text, the hortatory would seem to make sense. But what complicates such a conclusion is the future sense he links to his citation of 1 Cor 13.12. Similarly, Gregory of Nyssa's reference to this text in his *In illud* has left a conflicted tradition about whether he used the ω spelling or the \omicron spelling ⁵². Cyril of Alexandria referred to this text in several cases, one of which, found in his *Or. Reg.* 134, has similarly left a conflicted tradition ⁵³. Photius, *Fr. I Cor.* 15.49 presents an interesting case in that his textual tradition features not only conflicting spellings but also varying appearances of them in proximity ⁵⁴. Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Top.* 7.30, 34 is also interesting in that his text features both spellings and most of the manuscripts favor the ω reading in the two cases of 7.34, even though the context clearly indicates a future sense and Cosmas had already used the \omicron spelling in 7.30 ⁵⁵.

One final factor to consider about the external evidence is that evidence of the ω spelling does not necessarily imply evidence of the hortatory subjunctive. I unpack this point further below, but it is worth noting that in some patristic cases the context of the reference does not clearly indicate a subjunctive sense, and the reader may simply have encountered a different (or incorrect) spelling of the future indicative. Obviously,

⁴⁹ Another possible exception may be AMBROSIAS, *Comm. I Cor.* 15.49.

⁵⁰ SZYMIK, "Text-kritische", 122.

⁵¹ ω reading: SC 23:88; \omicron reading: PG 9:665.

⁵² ω reading: PG 44:1312; \omicron reading: J.K. DOWNING, *Gregory Nysseni opera*, Vol. 3, Part 2 (Leiden 1986) 12.

⁵³ The ω spelling appears in PG 76:1281; J.A. CRAMER (ed.), *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 5: *Catenae in Sancti Pauli Epistolas ad Corinthios ad Fidem Codd. Mss.* (Hildesheim 1967) 325-326. The \omicron spelling appears in ACO 1.1.5:95.

⁵⁴ The mixed spelling appears for different instances in CRAMER, *Catenae*, 327; STAAB, *Pauluskommentare*, 581.

⁵⁵ PG 88:353 features the ω spelling, as does E.O. WINSTEDT (ed.), *The Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes* (Cambridge 1909) 253, after earlier using the \omicron spelling on 251. For the consistent spelling in both cases, plus the manuscript evidence, see SC 197:91.

the manuscripts do not provide such clarifying context, and so it is not possible to determine whether the scribe considered the ω spelling an alternative spelling of the future or the typical spelling of the subjunctive. For all of these reasons, as well as the general limitations of the force of external evidence when it is not nearly unanimous, the external evidence is not as decisive as the advocates of this reading claim.

As for the second argument (i.e., *lectio difficilior*), as much as this argument has been a staple criterion in NT textual criticism, especially in the works of Johannes Bengel, J.J. Griesbach, and the co-authored works of B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, its weaknesses have led to its vitiation as a decisive criterion. Even if scribes may have had a tendency to smooth out difficult readings, sometimes a reading is difficult precisely because it does not work in the context and thus should not be preferred as part of the earliest recoverable text. Of course, the argument only works on the assumption that this spelling attests to the hortatory subjunctive. If the spelling is simply an alternative form of the future indicative, this argument simply does not apply.

That leaves the third argument: the insistence that the ω reading, taken as a hortatory subjunctive, fits the rhetorical context of this passage (as well as Paul's general rhetorical tendencies). Speculative structural claims are sandy foundations for such an argument, especially in light of complicating factors in this text. For example, v. 50 may be grouped with vv. 42-49 or with vv. 51-57, or it may serve as something of a hinge⁵⁶. But its presence here would further complicate the supposition of an ethical exhortation due to the intense whiplash effect it creates in such sudden shifts from didactic mode to exhortative mode and back again without a clear signal of transition that does something other than change the subject, as one sees in v. 35 and 16,1 (cf. Rom 6,11).

A further complicating factor is that, despite the claimed parallels with v. 34 and preceding, as well as v. 58, in each of those cases ethical instruction is both more extensive and more clearly warranted. Verses 33 and 34 follow directly from Paul's considerations of conduct in vv. 29-32 and thus serve as an appropriate summary. Verse 58 serves as a conclusion for the chapter as a whole, as well as a summary exhortation for the letter to this point, and the single imperative verb linked to two words that were tropes in ethical instruction, as well as the terms $\xi\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$, make this verse thoroughly ethically focused and exhortative. By contrast, if v. 49 is an exhortation, nothing has led directly to it. Verses 42-44 and

⁵⁶ J.D.G. DUNN, "How Are the Dead Raised? With What Body Do They Come? Reflections on 1 Corinthians 15", *SWJT* 45 (2002) 13.

46-47 have established a comparison and sequence of the body of the present age and the body of the age to come defined in relation to Adam and Christ as ψυχικός and πνευματικός respectively. Verses 45 and 47 particularly have established the framework by which to understand this comparison and sequence through the connections with Adam and Christ/the Last Adam. Verse 48 serves as the generalization by which Paul more directly connects Adam and Christ to two kinds of existence defined in relation to his audience not ethically, but somatically, cosmologically, and temporally. The need for establishing a sequence as Paul has done is less clear if his point in the Adam/Christ contrast here is ethical (as it is in Romans 5), whereas it is clear if Paul's point is that Christ has set the pattern for the future that believers can expect. The language of "wearing" the image also fits with the clothing language of vv. 53-54 as referring to resurrection (in this case) and transformation (in the latter case). But an exhortation here would rest entirely on the one verb.

While the kind of exhortation scholars suggest here would fit with what Paul has said elsewhere about the relationship of believers to the image of Christ or of being clothed in Christ in the present time (Rom 8,29; 2 Cor 3,18; Gal 3,27; cf. Col 3,10), this is not the statement he is making here ⁵⁷. Paul has been focused on responding to the questions in v. 35 — which, again, are not stated ethically — and directing the attention of his audience to the coming consummation. Just as Paul can vary his use of "clothing" language later in this text from referring to a mode of life in the present time to referring to eschatological transformation and reception of immortality, he can vary his "image" language from referring to a presently accessible reality to referring to the future experience of resurrection in conformity with Christ. It fits better with Paul's argument in this particular section to say that the believers have worn the image of Adam by virtue of their births into current "sown" bodily existence as defined in vv. 42-44, and so the fitting contrast would be that they will wear the image of Christ by virtue of their rising into the future resurrected/transformed bodily existence ⁵⁸.

Finally, the switch to first-person at once represents a natural transition from v. 48 and a shift in focus that carries into the following unit, where, unlike in any portion of the text since vv. 12-19, the first person proliferates. It is no more a signal for moving to ethical exhortation than the use

⁵⁷ Of the texts cited here, Rom 8,29 is the most wide-ranging in its scope of reference, as it can refer to the initiation, the process, and the consummation of being conformed to the image of Christ.

⁵⁸ For more on this interpretation of the language of "sowing", see J.R. ASHER, "Σπειρεται: Anthropogenic Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 15:42-44", *JBL* 120 (2001) 102-111.

of the first person in either vv. 12-19 or vv. 51-57. Indeed, there is no signal for ethical instruction, unlike in the transition from Romans 5 to Romans 6 by questions that pose ethical issues. The same applies to Paul's answer to the questions in Rom 6,15-19, whereas the question in v. 35 that drives the larger section of which v. 49 is a part does not imply asking for any ethical answer ⁵⁹.

II. WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THE SPELLING MAKE?

Despite its limitations, the argument that the number and variety of witnesses to the ω reading establish it as most likely the earliest recoverable reading seems to be the strongest in its favor. Why would the testimony be so overwhelmingly in this reading's favor among the earliest witnesses and among manuscripts in general if it was not the earliest established reading? It is true that the two vowels in question were frequently interchanged due to their pronunciation ⁶⁰. For example, in Edwin Mayser's study of Ptolemaic-era papyri, inscriptions, and ostraca in Egypt, he noted over 200 instances of interchange between these two vowels, including nearly two dozen cases of interchange specifically in verb or participle endings ⁶¹. The interchange was common enough in both directions that such tendencies alone can establish nothing in terms of probability in either direction.

To provide a more complete answer to the question of why one spelling would be so predominant (aside from obvious historical factors like influence of Rome on the one hand and Byzantium on the other), one must also account for the fact that the latter two arguments for the ω reading are based on the presumption that the spelling indicates the use of an aorist hortatory subjunctive. This is generally a safe presumption, but it is by no means certain. Rather, when one encounters the ω reading, there are three possibilities as to what ultimately produced and perpetuated it: (1) the ω reading was more amenable to a moralizing use of 1 Cor 15,49; (2) the ω reading could be the result of a spelling mistake; (3) the ω reading could be an alternative spelling for the future.

⁵⁹ I owe this last observation to CLABEAUX, *Lost Edition*, 94.

⁶⁰ See dozens of examples listed from the fifth century BCE to first century CE in CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 373 n. 99, 373-374 n. 101; A.N. JANNARIS, *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect* (Hildesheim 1968) 37. For other NT examples besides 1 Cor 15,49, note Mark 7,19; Rom 5,1; 14,19; Heb 2,3 (wherein $\text{ἰ}\text{ῶ}\text{ῃ}\text{ς}$ provides a singular reading of interchange); 6,3.

⁶¹ E. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften, Vol. 1, Part 1 (Berlin ²1970) 73-74, 75-76.

The first possibility of moralizing operates under the assumption that the ω reading could be a hortatory subjunctive and is more directly applicable to the patristic sources⁶². Indeed, most of the patristic uses of the ω reading — or of Latin translations of the same — appear in moralizing contexts of homilies or other texts aimed at moral formation, as will often be clear in the other biblical texts they cite (Tertullian, *Res.* 49; *Marc.* 5.10; Origen *Comm. Jo.* 2.47; *Hom. Gen.* 9.2; *Hom. Jer.* 2.1; Cyprian, *Test.* 2.10; 3.11; *Hab. virg.* 23; Methodius, *Res.* 2.18.5; Ambrose, *Fid. Grat.* 5.14; *Exp. Ps. 118* 12.12; John Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 42.2; Cyril of Alexandria, *Fr. Rom.* 8,29; *Comm. 1 Cor.* 15,49; *Comm. Heb.* 3,1-2)⁶³. As the spelling was associated with exhortation, it would be more amenable to ethically directed preaching and exposition. And if it was common for this sense to prevail in contexts of moral formation, this may in turn have shaped the expectations of some of the scribes who copied this text. If they had heard this text in sermons before, they would likely be accustomed to the ethical sense and assume that the “o” sound that the reader pronounced was an ω rather than an \circ . In cases where scribes were directly copying a manuscript they were reading, they did not question this sense of the verb and move to correct it, as it would be the one with which they were familiar.

The second possibility, that the reading could in some cases be the result of a spelling mistake — whether by readers or scribes — is the possibility of lowest confidence. After all, it is empirically identical with the alternative spelling option. It is possible in some of the conflicted cases above — especially for the work of Cosmas — that a spelling mistake occurred in the textual history, but without further context, such as in individual manuscripts, this option cannot be clearly distinguished from the alternative spelling possibility so as to make it more probable. However, it also cannot be entirely ruled out. Two of the earliest manuscripts in favor of the ω reading — \mathfrak{P}^{46} and \mathfrak{N} — feature numerous orthographic errors⁶⁴. Some of these were corrected by later scribes, but not all of

⁶² THISELTON (*1 Corinthians*, 1289) and ZELLER (*Korinther*, 505) both compare this issue to a similar vowel interchange in Rom 5,1, where they note other sources engaged in moralized reading.

⁶³ For instances where a different form of the verb or different expressions altogether are in use for conveying the idea that the wearing of this image is a present reality, see Origen, *Hom. Jer.* 8.2; 28.9; *Comm. Matt.* 14.7 (GCS 40:290); *Mart.* 37 (GCS 2:35); *Or.* 22.4-5; 23.4; 26.1; Basil, *Spir.* 14.32 (SC 17:360; PG 32:125).

⁶⁴ CARAGOUNIS (*Development*, 497, 499) counts 499 orthographic errors for \mathfrak{P}^{46} and 470 for \mathfrak{N} in the Gospel of John alone. For the former, E.B. EBOJO (“A Scribe and His Manuscript: An Investigation into the Scribal Habits of Papyrus 46 (P. Chester Beatty II – P. Mich. Inv. 6238)” [PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2014] 242) notes seventy-three cases of orthographic variation by vowel interchange that are grammatically and

them, and some of the corrections may not have strictly required correction⁶⁵. This is one of the cases that no corrector of a particular manuscript has changed to an *o* reading, since it is already a recognizable verb form. Given the option outlined below, it may be better to think of this option as an accidental spelling (e.g., *die* vs. *dye*) than a simple misspelling.

The third possibility — that the reading is, in some cases, simply an alternative spelling of the future form — has not been explored since Caragounis's proposal in his 1995 article on 1 Cor 13,3 or his reiteration of the same in the context of a larger text-critical analysis published in 2006⁶⁶. In those works, he proposed that the form *καυθήσωμαι* attested in some manuscripts of 1 Cor 13,3 is simply an alternative spelling of the future, attested elsewhere as *καυθήσομαι*. Indeed, historical Greek grammarians E.A. Sophocles and Antonius N. Jannaris recognize it as such⁶⁷.

Due to homophony, there are many examples of the future indicative being spelled with a thematic vowel of the subjunctive, giving it the appearance of the aorist subjunctive⁶⁸. Proposed examples of the future active with such spelling appear in the textual transmission of Matt 7,6 (*καταπατήσωσιν*); Mark 15,20 (*σταυρώσωσιν*); Luke 7,4 (*παρέξῃ*); John 7,3 (*θεωρήσωσιν*); 17,2 (*δώσῃ*); Acts 7,7 (*δουλεύσωσιν*); 1 Thess 5,10 (*ζήσωμεν*); Rev 3,9 (*ἥξωσιν, προσκυνήσωσιν*); 4,9 (*δώσωσιν*); 6,4 (*σφάξωσιν*); 8,3 (*δώσῃ*); 9,6 (*εὕρωσιν*), 20 (*προσκυνήσωσιν*); 12,6 (*τρέφωσιν*); and 13,12 (*προσκυνήσωσιν*)⁶⁹. Likewise, there are many proposed examples of the future middle or passive spelled with a thematic vowel of the subjunctive in the textual transmission of Acts 21,24 (*ζυρήσονται, γνώσονται*); the aforementioned 1 Cor 13,3 (*καυθήσωμαι*); Phil 2,11 (*ἐξομολογήσῃται*); 1 Tim 6,8 (*ἄρκεσθήσωμεθα*);

contextually sensible. He divides the remaining 830 variations of the text from UBS⁴ and NA²⁸ into 535 “itacisms and nasals” and 295 pure orthographic errors or nonsense spellings (242). For the full catalog of 1,939 variations of the manuscript from UBS⁴ and NA²⁸, see EBOJO, “Scribe”, 488-606. On *κ*, D.C. PARKER (*Codex Sinaiticus*. The Story of the World's Oldest Bible [London – Peabody, MA 2010] 79) notes that there have been 27,305 corrections throughout the manuscript's history.

⁶⁵ On the over 200 corrections scribes made to *ⲩ*⁴⁶, see EBOJO, “Scribe”, 619-637; J.W. PETERSON, “An Updated Correction List for Chester Beatty BP II + P.Mich. Inv. 6238 (Gregory-Aland Papyrus 46 [ⲩ⁴⁶])”, *BASPap* 56 (2019) 173-195.

⁶⁶ C.C. CARAGOUNIS, “‘To Boast’ or ‘To Be Burned’? The Crux of 1 Cor 13:3”, *SEA* 60 (1995) 115-127; IDEM, *Development*, 546-564.

⁶⁷ JANNARIS, *Historical Greek*, 556 [§ 11]; E.A. SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, Vol. 1 (New York 1887) 40.

⁶⁸ JANNARIS (*Historical Greek*, 179 [§ 678]) prefers to refer to this form as the “future subjunctive”, since, “from a logical and syntactical point of view, we cannot well conceive a past subjunctive and past imperative, such moods, owing to the nature of their special case, always referring to the future”.

⁶⁹ CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 558 n. 270; SOPHOCLES, *Lexicon*, 40. Cf. Justin, *Dial.* 115 (*δώσῃτε*). Also note *εἴπη* in Luke 11,5; 14,10.

Heb 2,3 (ᾠ⁴⁶: ἐκφευζόμεθα); 1 Pet 3,1 (κερδηθήσονται); Rev 6,11 (ἀναπαύσονται); and 14,13 (ἀναπαύσονται)⁷⁰. Indeed, the aorist subjunctive itself could impinge on the domain of the future indicative in several cases, including in the NT in Luke 8,17 (γινωσθῇ, ἔλθῃ) and John 10,28 (ἀπόλωνται)⁷¹. The permeability of the boundary between the future and subjunctive also manifests in the other direction as future indicatives appear in their normal spelling where one might expect the subjunctive (note the textual transmission of Matt 5,11; 7,6; 18,19; Mark 15,20; Luke 11,12; 13,28; 17,3; John 8,36; Acts 7,7; 21,24; 1 Cor 4,6; 13,3; Gal 2,4; Rev 3,9; 4,9; 6,4.11; 8,3; 9,4.20; 12,6; 14,13)⁷². However, unlike 1 Cor 15,49, this last group of uses all involve contexts that, usually, explicitly signal the presence of a subjunctive verb (usually ἵνα or οὐ μή). These indicators are what create the expectation for the subjunctive.

If the ω reading is indeed an alternate spelling, the problem is that it is identical with a much more common and more easily recognizable form. Given the factors of homophony, the permeability of the boundary between future indicative and aorist subjunctive (and thus of the frequent interchange between them), and the possibility that a contextual indicator of the subjunctive can also precede the future indicative, it is unsurprising that such alternate spellings of the future are attested primarily in the many textual variants where a homophonous spelling is also present in the textual history⁷³. For example, the variant of ποιήσωμεν in Heb 6,3

⁷⁰ CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 558 n. 271; JANNARIS, *Historical Greek*, 556 [§ 11]; SOPHOCLES, *Lexicon*, 40. Cf. Gen 2,17 (LXX) (φάγησθε); Justin, *1 Apol.* 7 (φανῆται); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 32.3 (παρалаίψωμαι); Agathias, *Hist.* 1.13 (πείσησθε); 3.11 (καθεστήξῃ). Also note Rev 9,5 (βασανισθήσων).

⁷¹ CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 555-556 n. 259; JANNARIS, *Historical Greek*, 555 [§ 8]. Cf. Job 7,9-10 (ἐπιστρέψῃ); Isa 10,14 (ἀντείπῃ); Dan 12,10 [Θ] (ἐκλεγχῶσιν, ἐκλευκανθῶσιν, πυρωθῶσιν, ἀνομήσωσιν); Tob 6,8 [Σ] (μείνωσιν); Homer, *Il.* 1:262 (ἴδωμαι); 6:459 (εἴπησιν); 7:197 (διῆται); *Od.* 12:383 (φαείνω); 16:437 (γένηται); *Hymn. Apoll.* 1 (λάθωμαι); Aeschylus, *Sept.* 38 (ληφθῶ); Sophocles, *Trach.* 1190 (λάβω); Euripides, *El.* 988 (πέσης); Xenophon, *Anab.* 2.2.12 (δύνηται); 7.3.26 (δείσης); Plato, *Symp.* 214a (μεθυσηθῇ); Demosthenes, *Andr.* 39 (δῶ); Barn. 17,2 (νοήσητε); 19,2 (κολληθήσῃ), 3 (λήμψῃ), 11 (γνώσῃ); Herm(s) 5.7.3 (σωθῇ).

⁷² CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 556-557 nn. 262, 264, 557; JANNARIS, *Historical Greek*, 198-199 [§ 779]. Cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Virt. (Or. 8)* 28; Herm. *Vis.* 1.3.2; *Acts Thom.* 83.36; 133.9; *Acts Andr.* 2; *Mart. Bart.* 7. For the comments of Lesbonax, *Peri Schematon* 20a on the use of μή with the future, see CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 556 n. 261.

⁷³ As an additional illustrative example with this same spelling issue, see Plutarch, *Suav. viv.* 1087b (ἐπιχειρήσωμεν). JANNARIS (*Historical Greek*, 552) notes that reference to future action was distributed between the future indicative, the non-indicative moods, the infinitive, and the present indicative, “With the gradual retreat of the secondary subjunctive [optative] [...] of the 3rd person imperative [...] and above all of the infinitive [...] and their succession mostly by the primary subjunctive simple or in company with the appropriate conjunction, but particularly with ἵνα [...] this mood — the primary subjunctive — became as it were the sole heir and successor of all extinct moods and thus came to be

obviously looks like an aorist subjunctive that is otherwise out of place in the text (cf. Jas 4,15), and that is indeed how Theodoret interprets it in *Comm. Heb.* 6,1-3. However, outside of Theodoret, we do not find evidence of this spelling with this interpretation, and so it may perhaps be better understood in this context without any subjunctive indicators as an alternative homophonous spelling of the future ποιήσομεν⁷⁴. Likewise, the lone reading from \mathfrak{P}^{46} of ἐκφενξώμεθα in Heb 2,3 indicates the presence of an alternative spelling of the future, as this is not the subjunctive form of the verb (ἐκφύγωμεν)⁷⁵.

Furthermore, some of the particular uses of φορέσωμεν in the patristic witnesses may indicate such an alternative spelling of the future. Both of the uses of this text in Irenaeus indicate a presently accessible reality, but the context also keeps the future — the consummation of this image-bearing in the resurrection — in view (*Haer.* 5.9.3; 5.11.2). Origen's reference in *Fr. 1 Cor.* 13 is one whose meaning he does not further explore, and the portion of his commentary that directly addressed v. 49 is still lost. The context may indicate an ethical sense, but because he did not specifically comment on this verbiage, it is difficult to be sure. In other cases, both the future and hortatory senses may fit, but the context indicates a focus on the future resurrection (*Comm. Jo.* 20.228-236; *Comm. Rom.* 9,1; *Cels.* 5.19; cf. *Or.* 26.5). Methodius's aforementioned reference in *Res.* 2.18.5 is clearly hortatory with its focus on walking in the newness of life, but he also appeals to the same text later, without using the verb in question, as a reference to literal resurrection (*Res.* 2.18.8-9)⁷⁶. Cyril of Alexandria is particularly interesting in this regard as he has the most extant uses of this text, and these uses feature both spellings in different contexts. Mostly, the ω reading seems to have served Cyril's ethical purposes, but there is at least one case where the context is a matter of Trinitarian theology and either sense could work (*Thes. Trin.* 33)⁷⁷.

In light of these considerations, one reason for the popularity of the φορέσωμεν form may have been its ambiguity. It could be (and most often was) a hortatory subjunctive, but it could also evoke the future as a secondary spelling of the future indicative. It could be (and was) used in a greater variety of contexts for different purposes than the more restrictive spelling of φορέσομεν.

felt as the principal exponent of future action". On the development of the Greek future in general, see CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 158-159, 318-319; JANNARIS, *Historical Greek*, 559.

⁷⁴ CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 546.

⁷⁵ CARAGOUNIS, *Development*, 546.

⁷⁶ GCS 27:370.

⁷⁷ Cf. *ACO* 1,1,7:99, which similarly uses this spelling without a clear hortatory context. Basil, *Eun.* 4 is also not easily distinguishable by its context.

III. WHAT BEST EXPLAINS THE VARIANTS?

The most fundamental failing of the case for the ω reading is that its advocates have failed to present a sound case for this reading being the best explanation of the history of textual variation. In fact, they have generally considered it sufficient to satisfy the criterion of best reading by arguing that it satisfies other traditional criteria to which they have already appealed⁷⁸. One could of course appeal to the homophony factor to explain how the \omicron was mistaken for the ω reading. But the reading can explain nothing else. If it is the more difficult reading, it cannot explain why there were no obvious scribal efforts to correct it. If it fits the context as well if not better, this argument would undermine the previous one. And since both of these arguments rest on the assumption that the ω reading is an aorist hortatory subjunctive, it cannot as easily explain some of the more ambiguous appearances of this term among the patristic sources. Nor can it explain how a future form has in some cases supplanted a contextually sensible subjunctive when there are no contextual indicators to create an expectation of a subjunctive.

On the other hand, I argue, with the majority, that what best explains the existence of both variants is that the earliest recoverable spelling was the primary future spelling with the \omicron rather than the ω . The future indicative makes the most sense in context, whereas a sudden subjunctive does not. The more restrictive spelling of the future indicative with the \omicron then produced the alternative ω spelling via homophony, a spelling which could be the secondary spelling of the future indicative or the aorist hortatory subjunctive, if not a misspelling (or an accidental spelling). It is not difficult to imagine that such a variation occurred early in the process, given the general tendencies noted above regarding the interchange between these vowels. This alternative spelling would then perpetuate due to its ambiguity and its greater variety of uses, such as being more useful in contexts of moral formation, which could in turn have influenced other scribes to assume that this alternative spelling had always been present. Alongside this strand of ω reading, the earlier \omicron spelling also persisted, not as part of any attempt to correct perceived errors in the manuscripts, but as a testimony to the earliest recoverable spelling.

The reading of $\varphi\rho\epsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ provides the best explanation for both variants as the earliest recoverable reading in that it satisfies the criteria for the best explanation. It is more plausible by virtue of its better fit in the context. It has better explanatory power than the alternative, since the

⁷⁸ BOTHA, "1 Korintiërs 15:49b", 761; BRODEUR, *Holy Spirit's Agency*, 141; FEE, *Corinthians*, 871 n. 324.

other account cannot adequately explain this reading as something beyond homophony. It has better explanatory scope by virtue of its ability to explain both variants adequately and the variety of causes that could have caused the divergence. And it is more illuminating of the variety of uses of this text in its history and of why different spellings may have been used. Neither explanation is necessarily simpler than the other, but in all other criteria the greater antiquity of the $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ reading is the better explanation for the variants.

IV. CONCLUSION

The case in favor of the reading of $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ in 1 Cor 15,49 being the earliest recoverable one is of no small account, but it is not especially compelling, given the weaknesses of the three main arguments in its favor and how they operate in tension with each other. The external evidence is extensive, but the external evidence for $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ cannot be easily dismissed. The argument from the more difficult reading is much less compelling when the other two arguments undermine it, and the argument from contextual fit is too strongly in favor of the future indicative, particularly in its primary spelling of $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$. It is more likely that the $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ reading arose and perpetuated from a combination of factors of moralized reading and proclamation, accidental spelling and/or alternative spelling of the future indicative. The $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ reading is the best reading in that it provides the best explanation for its own existence and the existence of the alternative.

Asbury Theological Seminary
204 N Lexington Ave,
Wilmore, KY 40390 (U.S.A.)

K.R. HARRIMAN

SUMMARY

A recent trend in scholarship on 1 Corinthians presents the verb $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ (taken as an aorist hortatory subjunctive) as the earliest recoverable reading, as opposed to the reading of $\varphi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ (taken as a future indicative). These scholars have appealed to the merits of the ω spelling in satisfying certain text-critical criteria. However, I argue that their applications of these criteria are flawed. Furthermore, I illustrate how scholars who argue for this reading fail to account for all the possibilities of why the ω spelling is present and thus fail to demonstrate adequately that this reading best explains all variants.

QUESTIONS ACTUELLES SUR LA LETTRE AUX PHILIPPIENS: PROPOSITIONS CRITIQUES

Jusqu'à ces dernières décennies, pour les questions théologiques qu'ils soulevaient, les passages les plus étudiés de la lettre aux Philippiens étaient les *exempla* de Ph 2,6-11 et 3,1 – 4,1. Mais depuis, comme je l'ai signalé dans un précédent article ¹, l'exégèse de l'ecclésiologie des lettres de Paul — et de celle-ci en particulier — est devenue principalement, pour ne pas dire exclusivement, socio-historique, proposant un cadre général d'interprétation qui situe les réflexions de l'apôtre en relation au contexte politique de Philippiens, colonie romaine, mais aussi aux liens sociaux de l'époque: amitié, évergétisme, clientélisme et associations. Si l'évergétisme, le clientélisme et les associations d'alors ont été systématiquement étudiés depuis au moins six décennies, leurs relations à la lettre aux Philippiens est récente. L. PIALOUX est un des premiers à avoir systématiquement et longuement présenté la lettre en relation à cet arrière-fond et à avoir mis en valeur les traces qu'il y a laissées ². Dans les lignes qui suivent, je me propose de voir si, effectivement, la lettre aux Philippiens fait écho, voire allusion à l'évergétisme et au clientélisme du I^{er} siècle de notre ère et d'interpréter en conséquence les réflexions de Paul. Mais comme un autre arrière-fond, civique et politique cette fois, a été également proposé pour Philippiens, je m'interrogerai également sur la pertinence de cette suggestion et sur les raisons qui ont amené Paul à utiliser les vocables πολιτεύεσθαι et πολιτεύμα en cette lettre.

I. L'ÉVERGÉTISME ET LE CLIENTÉLISME: UN ARRIÈRE-FOND SOCIAL DE PHILIPPIENS?

Pour L. PIALOUX, Philippiens est une lettre d'amitié. Parce que le vocabulaire de l'amitié (φιλία) est absent de cette lettre et des autres lettres de Paul ³, PIALOUX a évidemment cherché à relever quelques-uns des *topoi* confirmant cette lecture. Présenter ici ce que signifie et implique la φιλία

¹ J.-N. ALETTI, «Exegesis of the Ecclesiology of the Pauline Letters in the XXth Century. A Status Quaestionis and a Changing Paradigm», *Bib* 97 (2016) 564-580.

² L. PIALOUX, *L'épître aux Philippiens*, L'Évangile du don et de l'amitié (EB NS 75; Leuven 2017) 310-328 et 427-433.

³ Le verbe φιλέω se trouve seulement en 1Co 16,22; Tt 3,15 et ne permet pas de conclure que ces deux lettres sont d'amitié.

au temps de Paul nous mènerait trop loin. Disons seulement que si le substantif grec *φιλία* est absent des lettres pauliniennes, c'est probablement parce qu'il a été remplacé, comme le notent nombre d'exégètes, par le vocabulaire de l'*ἀγάπη* — l'*ἀγάπη* vient de Dieu et opère grâce à son aide, et diffère ainsi d'une amitié naturelle. Cela n'empêche pas, toutefois, Philippiens d'être une lettre d'amitié, au sens où Paul multiplie les formules pour montrer à ses destinataires qu'il leur est proche ⁴. Cela dit, les deux grands *exempla*, celui de Christ, en Ph 2,5/6-11, et celui de Paul, en Ph 3,4-14, n'ont pas pour but de renforcer l'amitié, mais de présenter des modèles antithétiques à la recherche des honneurs alors en vigueur, comme l'indique la déclaration bien connue de Dion Chrysostome, *Oratio* 29,21: «il faut que les hommes vivent pour (recevoir) louange et bonne gloire, et qu'ils pratiquent la vertu» (χρὴ ἄνδρας πρὸς ἐπαινον καὶ δόξαν ἀγαθὴν βιοῦντας καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ὄντας ἀσκητάς). Voilà pourquoi, si l'on peut admettre que la *φιλία* soit le genre épistolaire de Philippiens, il importe d'ajouter que le motif pour lequel cette lettre fut écrite est autre, à savoir (i) inviter les croyants de Philippe à être humbles (Ph 2,3) et à refuser fermement d'entrer dans la recherche tellement partagée des honneurs en ce temps-là ⁵. En effet, bien que de condition divine, Jésus ne voulut ni honneur ni gloire de la part des hommes; il s'humilia jusqu'à devenir *δοῦλος* et à mourir sur une croix. De même, Paul, au commencement fier de ses origines et de la perfection avec laquelle il observait la loi mosaïque, refusa également honneurs et gloire pour connaître et suivre l'itinéraire humble du Christ. L'un et l'autre ont voulu tout perdre, droits et privilèges, pour recevoir reconnaissance et honneur non de la part des hommes, mais de Dieu seul (Ph 2,9-11 et 3,12-14). (ii) Cette raison d'être a un corollaire: l'apôtre veut inviter les croyants à donner sans vouloir recevoir quoi que ce soit en échange, en particulier louange et honneur. Comme le dit également PIALOUX, en Philippiens, Paul cherche à «se départir de la culture de l'obligation, marquée par la mentalité du *do ut des*» ⁶.

Il serait trop long et inutile de reprendre les analyses par lesquelles PIALOUX montre que le langage de Philippiens fait écho à l'évergétisme ⁷

⁴ Cf. Ph 1,7a.8; 2,1-2.12.17-18; 4,1.10.15.

⁵ Voir ce que dit P. VEYNE dans son essai sur l'évergétisme, *Le pain et le cirque*. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique (Paris 1976) 99: l'ostentation «est tantôt une perversion et tantôt un excès; [elle] est perversion, quand un homme se conduit admirablement pour être vu comme admirable et qu'il prend comme fin le prestige, qui n'est que la conséquence de l'excellence; l'ostentation est excès quand l'homme supérieur déploie un appareil qui est disproportionné avec sa supériorité».

⁶ PIALOUX, *L'épître aux Philippiens*, 243.

⁷ Cf. PIALOUX, *L'épître aux Philippiens*, 140-142 (pour Ph 1,11), 44-46 et 240-241 (pour Ph 2,25), 38-39 (pour Ph 4,10-2), et le résumé des pp. 318-319.

et au clientélisme, moteurs de cohésion sociale dans le monde d'alors. Après les avoir succinctement décrits, je me contenterai de vérifier rapidement s'il y a des allusions à l'évergétisme et au clientélisme en Philippiens ⁸.

Selon Veyne, l'évergétisme est un phénomène typiquement grec, né au IV^e avant J.C., lorsqu'Athènes passa de la démocratie à la gestion de la cité par des notables (l'oligarchie). En effet, si dans les commencements, tout citoyen ⁹ avait le droit de gérer les affaires de la πόλις, à cause du coût toujours plus élevé des différents services, le gouvernement de la πόλις devint peu à peu l'apanage des plus riches, lesquels manifestèrent leur supériorité grâce à un mécénat en faveur du peuple. En bref, l'évergétisme est l'expression de la supériorité et de l'excellence d'hommes nobles, riches et vertueux, et aussi la manifestation de leur responsabilité civique envers la collectivité. Les libéralités des évergètes n'ont pas comme destinataires les familles ou les individus pauvres ¹⁰, mais une cité ou une région entière. Il vaut donc mieux éviter de juger trop rapidement le manque d'attention des évergètes aux pauvres, car les dons de l'évergète vont à la ville ou à la région, alors que ceux du patron ont des individus pour bénéficiaires.

Les historiens notent l'évolution de l'évergétisme. Initialement désintéressé, il devint progressivement une sorte d'acquisition de l'honneur et de la gloire qu'on a le droit de recevoir pour exercer une magistrature. En bref, avec l'empire, l'évergétisme devint *ob honorem*. Les philosophes dénoncèrent la recherche inconsidérée des honneurs, mais sans critiquer l'évergétisme comme système social structurel. Il a été par ailleurs dit qu'il fut toujours critiqué et rejeté dans le judaïsme ¹¹. PIALOUX cite à cet égard la critique féroce de Philon dans son traité *De cherubim* (122-123) ¹². Mais

⁸ PIALOUX, *Philippiens*, 310-319. Dans sa description de l'évergétisme, l'auteur utilise et se recommande de P. VEYNE, *Le pain et le cirque*, 183-344, essai décisif sur l'évergétisme.

⁹ Les habitants d'une cité n'étaient pas tous citoyens: la citoyenneté ne s'obtenait pas par nature, mais par accord. En d'autres termes, il ne suffisait pas de naître dans une cité pour en être citoyen. Cf. VEYNE, *Le pain et le cirque*, 206.

¹⁰ Le NT utilise le terme πτωχοί et non πένητες, excepté en 2 Cor 9,9 (citation du Ps 111/112,9). Les πτωχοί sont des indigents, alors que les πένητες sont pauvres mais non indigents. Paul lui-même a voulu vivre en πένης. Notons en passant que le terme πτωχός n'apparaît pas en Philippiens, indice qui confirme la lecture selon laquelle le problème affronté par l'apôtre en cette lettre n'est ni l'évergétisme ni le patronage.

¹¹ Mais, si l'on en croit VEYNE, *Le pain et le cirque*, 346, n. 199, cette interdiction doit être relativisée: «l'évergétisme se retrouve dans ces associations très particulières que sont les synagogues juives: l'archonte ou le géronte de la synagogue fait des libéralités ou verse une somme honoraire (J. JUSTER, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*. Leur condition juridique, économique, et sociale, 2 vols. [Paris 1914] 1:441)».

¹² PIALOUX, *L'épître aux Philippiens*, 315-316.

il ne faut pas oublier que cette course aux honneurs — plus que le désir d'ascension sociale — était aussi partagée par les notables israélites, et c'est cette attitude — plus que l'évergétisme — que Paul veut éradiquer de la mentalité des destinataires de ses lettres.

Quant au clientélisme, P. Veyne déclare qu'il est typiquement romain, les relations personnelles asymétriques entre les patrons — patriciens et nobles — et leurs clients — pas seulement plébéiens — étant nombreuses dans les cités romaines, en un temps où bienfaisance et clientèle allaient de pair. Les premiers aidaient et protégeaient les seconds en échange de leur fidélité — relation de type *do ut des*.

Cet arrière-fond social ayant été rapidement présenté, j'avoue ne pas pouvoir trouver de passages de Philippiens qui feraient écho à l'évergétisme, et encore moins au clientélisme. Paul ne déclare en aucune des sections de Philippiens qu'il n'est pas patron; il ne demande pas davantage à ses destinataires de se comporter en clients. L'interprétation qu'il fait de leurs dons en Ph 4,10-20 rappelle plutôt les relations entre membres des associations, où la *κοινωνία* était connue et vécue¹³, les membres (les) plus aisés venant en aide aux plus défavorisés. Même si, comme l'indiquent les spécialistes des origines chrétiennes, il est difficile, voire impossible, de montrer que l'organisation des Églises de la Macédoine était celle des associations, il faut néanmoins reconnaître les traits communs existant entre ces Églises et les associations d'alors. PIALOUX lui-même note que les exhortations de Philippiens supposent une transformation des relations de patronage et de *φιλία*, car elles sont essentiellement faites de gratuité et ne sont pas basées sur l'obligation de rendre comme à un patron ce qui a été reçu¹⁴.

Au terme de ces brèves réflexions sur l'arrière-fond social grâce auquel les positions de Philippiens deviennent plus claires, il importe de répéter que les paroles les plus décisives de l'apôtre concernent le refus de la gloire et de l'honneur qui viennent des hommes. L'exemple de Ph 2,6-11 ne dit en effet rien sur le don fait par le Christ ni sur ses destinataires, ni sur sa gratuité; l'insistance y est seulement mise sur le refus de la gloire et de l'honneur et sur la volonté qui fut celle du Christ d'aller à l'extrême opposé. Il en est de même pour Paul, en Philippiens 3, qui n'insiste pas sur l'Évangile gracieusement annoncé aux Philippiens, mais sur le renoncement aux privilèges qui étaient les siens dans le judaïsme ainsi qu'à la gloire et à l'honneur qui en étaient les corollaires: *l'apôtre ne lie pas bienfaisance et recherche des honneurs*. Il revient bien plutôt sur le désir

¹³ Pour la *κοινωνία* en Philippiens, voir 1,5 et 4,15.

¹⁴ PIALOUX, *L'épître aux Philippiens*, 237.

d'être honoré et reconnu par le plus grand nombre — qu'il soit cause ou effet de la bienfaisance ¹⁵ — pour proposer un modèle opposé et extrême, celui du renoncement à toute espèce de gloire humaine ¹⁶. Il importe aussi de signaler 2 Cor 8,9, où le don ne vient pas de la richesse, mais de la pauvreté (πτωχεία) volontairement assumée par le Christ.

L'insistance de Paul sur le sujet se rencontre aussi assez souvent dans les récits évangéliques: en Matthieu 6, à propos de la prière, du jeûne et de l'aumône, également dans les passages où Jésus admoneste ses adversaires, parce qu'ils veulent être admirés des foules (Lc 20,46 et par.), et lorsqu'il demande à ceux qui veulent être ses disciples de servir sans chercher à être honorés par les hommes (Lc 22,25-30 et par.). C'est en effet la course aux honneurs que Jésus et, après lui, Paul, a dénoncé comme fondamentalement contraire à l'Évangile. Mais l'exégèse néotestamentaire n'a pas eu besoin de connaître les mécanismes de l'évergétisme et du clientélisme pour prendre conscience de l'importance de ce leitmotiv.

II. Πολιτεύεσθαι ET πολίτευμα EN PH 1,27 ET 3,20:

UN ARRIÈRE-FOND CIVIQUE ET POLITIQUE?

Si j'ai décidé de réexaminer ces deux vocables grecs, ce n'est pas parce qu'ils sont décisifs pour l'interprétation d'ensemble de Philippiens, mais parce qu'ils sont l'objet de deux approches différentes, la première, exégétique, et l'autre, historique. Si les exégètes sont sensibles aux modèles littéraires, à la cohérence du tissu épistolaire paulinien, les historiens pensent que la signification et la désignation de ces deux *hapax legomena* pauliniens doivent être déterminées par celles qu'ils ont ailleurs, dans les écrits juifs intertestamentaires (2 Mac, lettre d'Aristée, Philon d'Alexandrie, Flavius Josèphe), dans les écrits classiques et dans les inscriptions grecques de l'époque. On admettra volontiers que, pour déterminer le sens d'un *hapax legomenon*, il importe de voir si le terme apparaît ailleurs, sinon il est extrêmement difficile voire impossible d'arriver à un résultat entièrement fiable. C'est ce qu'exégètes et historiens font pour le πολίτευμα de Ph 3,20. Et comme ils ne sont pas d'accord — les historiens ayant tendance à penser que le sens proposé par les exégètes est anachronique —, il m'a semblé important de réanalyser ce verset de Philippiens,

¹⁵ Sur le sujet, voir l'observation de P. VEYNE, *Le pain et le cirque*, 271: «Loin d'expliquer l'évergétisme, le goût des honneurs s'explique par l'évergétisme».

¹⁶ Sur le modèle proposé par Paul, voir A. PEREIRA DELGADO, *De Apóstol a esclavo. El exemplum de Pablo en 1 Corintios 9* (AnBib 182; Roma 2010).

car que signifie et désigne le substantif πολιτεύμα? En reprenant les analyses, je veux seulement souligner, pour nous, exégètes, l'importance du contexte littéraire immédiat pour déterminer le sens du vocable.

Mais, avant de parler du πολιτεύμα de Ph 3,20, voyons quel sens donner au πολιτεύεσθε de Ph 1,27, car il est admis que l'usage de ce verbe aide à comprendre celui de Ph 3,20.

1. *L'impératif πολιτεύεσθε de Ph 1,27*

Il est inutile de montrer que le πολιτεύεσθε de ce verset est un impératif présent: cela est admis par tous. Ce qui l'est moins, c'est de savoir si l'on doit laisser au verbe son sens original fort et traduire: «Comportez-vous en citoyens d'une manière digne de l'Évangile du Christ», ou, au contraire, si l'on doit donner au verbe un sens métaphorique et lire simplement: «Comportez-vous de manière digne de l'Évangile». La raison principale pour laquelle beaucoup préfèrent le sens fort est que la ville antique de Philippiques étant une colonie romaine, ses habitants, et parmi eux les disciples du Christ, étaient πολῖται. Le contexte civique et politique de Philippiques invite ainsi à choisir le sens fort et original. Mais, grâce au livre des Actes, nous savons que tous les disciples du Christ à Philippiques n'avaient pas la citoyenneté grecque: en effet, les personnages de Philippiques mentionnés en Actes 16 qui ont cru en l'Évangile, Lydia, le geôlier et leurs familles respectives, n'avaient pas la πολιτεία grecque — ils étaient πάροικοι ou μέτοικοι et n'étaient assurément pas les seuls. Si donc plusieurs des premiers chrétiens de Philippiques n'étaient pas πολῖται, Paul les inviterait à vivre et à se comporter comme s'ils l'étaient. Voilà pourquoi il est préférable de ne pas exclure le sens métaphorique, à l'époque déjà bien connu, du verbe πολιτεύεσθαι. Cela dit, si Paul utilise le verbe πολιτεύομαι, c'est aussi parce qu'une bonne partie des chrétiens de Philippiques étaient probablement πολῖται. Pour ceux qui étaient tels, la connotation est politique: ils doivent être non seulement des citoyens, mais des citoyens animés d'un esprit évangélique; et pour ceux qui n'étaient pas πολῖται, le signifié est métaphorique: ils doivent, tout comme leurs frères πολῖται de Philippiques, vivre d'une manière digne de l'Évangile. À n'en pas douter, Paul joue sur le double sens du verbe.

2. *La πολιτεία, son usage en 2–4 Maccabées et dans le NT*

Le substantif πολιτεία ne se trouve pas en Philippiques, mais seulement en 2–4 Maccabées, en Ac 22,28 (où il désigne la citoyenneté romaine,

l'êtr̃e-ῥωμαῖος ¹⁷), et en Ep 2,12 (où il désigne la citoyenneté d'Israël). Comme ce relevé succinct le montre, le Paul des Protopauliniennes n'utilise pas le substantif πολιτεία pour situer les communautés chrétiennes parmi les très nombreux groupes de l'époque. En effet, si l'on compare la manière dont Philon d'Alexandrie, désireux d'obtenir la πολιτεία alexandrine, compare la πολιτεία judéenne et celle des Grecs, et ce que les Protopauliniennes disent de l'identité des Églises, la différence est obvie. Rappelons seulement ici que ceux qu'on appelle les judaïsants voulaient que les ethnico-chrétiens fussent circoncis. Avec les catégories de P. Gauthier ¹⁸, on dira qu'ils voulaient intégrer les ethnico-chrétiens dans la πολιτεία d'Israël, en leur donnant une identité plus haute et plus universelle — comme disait Philon de celle de Moïse ¹⁹ — que celles offertes par les cités et les autorités politiques de l'écoumène de l'époque. Mais, en voulant cela, ils mettaient les ethnico-chrétiens dans la même situation que les Judéens d'Alexandrie, en les rendant ἀλλότριοι et πάροικοι aux yeux des citoyens (grecs) des cités où ils vivaient. Si, parce que πάροικοι ou esclaves, bien des membres des communautés chrétiennes ne pouvaient revendiquer une quelconque appartenance politique, d'autres étaient πολῖται, et, pour Paul, le groupe chrétien devait conserver socialement cet aspect mixte et varié, et faire en sorte que les différences discriminantes liées aux strates sociales et religieuses fussent exclues. En refusant de faire entrer les ethnico-chrétiens dans la πολιτεία de Moïse, en refusant donc de faire du groupe chrétien un peuple — λαός ou ἔθνος, peu importe ici —, Paul a de façon géniale compris que l'Évangile n'était pas un système législatif particulier fixant l'identité d'un peuple, mais qu'il interpellait tous les systèmes législatifs et ethniques. En bref, le groupe chrétien n'est pas de type ethnique, car, pour Paul, n'être pas un ἔθνος n'est pas un handicap, quoi qu'en aient dit Celse et d'autres après lui ²⁰.

¹⁷ Le mot ῥωμαῖος a la même dénotation en Ac 22,25.26.27.29 et 23,27.

¹⁸ Ph. GAUTHIER, «Métèques, périèques et paroikoi. Bilan et point d'interrogation», in R. LONIS (éd.), *L'étranger dans le monde grec* (Travaux et mémoires. Études anciennes 7; Nancy 1992) 23-46.

¹⁹ PHILON, *Legatio ad Caium*, 194: «En quel endroit serait-il permis par la loi divine ou la loi humaine que nous dépensions en vain tant d'efforts à prouver (que nous sommes) Alexandrins, nous contre qui pèse un danger qui menace une πολιτεία, celle des Juifs, plus universelle (καθολικότερα)? Avec la suppression du Temple, en effet, il est à craindre que le nom commun à toute la nation ne soit complètement effacé sur l'ordre de cet agitateur prétentieux». Sur cette question voir S. HONIGMAN, «Philon, Flavius Josèphe et la citoyenneté alexandrine», *Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (1997) 62-90.

²⁰ Critique relatée par S. MASON, «Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism. Problems of Categorization in Ancient History», *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007) 457-512.

La deuxième partie de Ga 3,28, «mais vous êtes tous un (εἷς) en Christ» — énoncé théologique — n'est pas très éloignée de la dénomination χριστιανοί — énoncé socio-historique — d'Ac 11,26 et invite à se demander si, pour Paul, l'identité sociale du groupe chrétien ne serait pas plutôt associative.

Si le terme πολιτεία est absent des Protopauliniennes, il apparaît néanmoins dans les Deutéropauliniennes, plus exactement en Ep 2,12, dont j'ai ailleurs suffisamment parlé pour ne pas avoir à m'y attarder ici ²¹. Pour faire bref, disons seulement que le Paul d'Éphésiens ne l'applique pas aux ethnico-chrétiens pour dire qu'ils partagent désormais la πολιτεία d'Israël, car il commence par présenter les deux groupes, Israël et les Nations, en leurs situations et identités religieuses opposées et tranchées, pour mieux souligner les manques des Nations. L'emploi du vocable πολιτεία a l'avantage de l'ambiguïté: en focalisant sur la citoyenneté, Paul laisse dans l'ombre les institutions juives, autrement dit la loi mosaïque, facteur fondamental de l'identité du *Ioudaios*, car, à la différence de Rm 9,4 qui énumère la νομοθεσία parmi les privilèges historiques d'Israël, Ep 2,12 ne la mentionne pas, car elle n'a rien d'un avantage, puisque, déclare-t-il, elle est un mur de haine et de division (Ep 2,14-15). Mais en Ep 2,19, alors qu'il décrit la transformation opérée par le Christ à la situation d'inimitié antérieure, il dit néanmoins que les ethnico-chrétiens sont devenus «concitoyens des saints» (συμπολιται τῶν ἁγίων). Le syntagme n'entend assurément pas dire qu'ils ont acquis la citoyenneté d'Israël, car ils auraient alors dû obéir à ses institutions, autrement dit à la Loi qui a été abolie par le Christ en croix (v. 15). Or, c'est des «saints» que les chrétiens issus de la gentilité sont désormais συμπολιται ²². Et comme en Éphésiens l'adjectif ἅγιοι désigne uniformément les chrétiens, et qu'il n'a aucun indice lui permettant de changer de référent en 2,19, le lecteur doit comprendre qu'il s'agit des chrétiens, déclarés maintenant saints, parce que sanctifiés par l'agir du Christ décrit aux v. 14-18 ²³. Le glissement sémantique est intéressant: amené en quelque sorte à utiliser le vocabulaire identitaire civique et politique à cause de la mention d'Israël, le Paul d'Éphésiens réoriente drastiquement l'idée de citoyenneté et reste paradoxalement fidèle aux positions du Paul des Protopauliniennes.

²¹ J.-N. ALETTI, *L'épître aux Éphésiens* (EB NS 42; Paris 2001) 142-144 et 158-161; IDEM, *Essai sur l'ecclésiologie des lettres de saint Paul* (EB NS 60; Paris 2009) 154-157.

²² Sur la συμπολιτεία, on consultera, entre autres, Ch. MÜLLER, «La (dé)construction de la politeia: Citoyenneté et octroi de privilèges aux étrangers dans les démocraties hellénistiques», *Annales HSS* 3 (2014) 753-775, en particulier 756 n. 19.

²³ Cette exégèse est désormais majoritaire. On trouvera dans les deux ouvrages cités en note 20 la liste des commentaires qui la font leur.

3. *Le πολίτευμα de Ph 3,20*

Ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει,
ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

En effet, notre πολίτευμα se trouve dans les cieux,
d'où nous attendons aussi comme sauveur le Seigneur Jésus Christ.

3.1. Problèmes linguistiques

Le ἐξ οὗ peut avoir πολίτευμα comme antécédent, car l'un et l'autre sont au singulier et au neutre, mais le substantif πολίτευμα n'ayant pas de connotation spatiale, le ἐξ οὗ doit en conséquence avoir comme antécédent l'autre substantif, «cieux», pourtant au pluriel. En outre, puisque le sens de πολίτευμα n'est pas spatial, il ne peut être traduit pas «cité», la parole grecque exacte ayant alors été πόλις.

Le syntagme «Seigneur Jésus Christ» étant le complément direct, le terme «sauveur» doit alors être prédicat/attribut et traduit «comme sauveur» — «attendant comme sauveur le Seigneur Jésus Christ». En effet, «sauveur» ne peut être le complément d'objet direct, le syntagme final «Seigneur Jésus Christ» étant alors une apposition — «attendant le sauveur, [c'est-à-dire] le Seigneur Jésus Christ». En effet, si le syntagme final était une apposition il ne serait pas séparé du mot «sauveur».

3.2. Traductions représentatives du v. 20a:

- G. Fee: «But, our citizenship is in Heaven»²⁴.
- A. Pitta: «Infatti, la nostra cittadinanza appartiene ai cieli»²⁵.
- J.N. Aletti: «Pour nous, notre constitution se trouve dans les cieux»²⁶.
- F. Bianchini: «Ciò che governa noi, in effetti, è nei cieli»²⁷.
- C. Focant: «Car notre force constitutive se trouve dans les cieux»²⁸.
- E. Ebel: «Unser Bürgerrecht aber ist in den Himmeln»²⁹.
- L. Pialoux: «citoyenneté... selon l'Évangile» (327-328), «céleste» (351), «commune et glorieuse» (393).

²⁴ *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 375.

²⁵ *Lettera ai Filippesi* (I libri Biblici — NT 11; Milano 2010) 208.

²⁶ *Saint Paul. Épître aux Philippiens* (EB NS 55; Paris 2005) 273.

²⁷ *Lettera ai Filippesi* (Nuova versione della Bibbia dai testi antichi 47; Cinisello Balsamo 2010) 83.

²⁸ *Les lettres aux Philippiens et à Philémon* (CBNT 11; Paris 2015) 179.

²⁹ «Unser *politeuma* aber ist in der Himmeln (Ph 3, 20)», in J. FREY – B. SCHLIESSER (éd.), *Der Philipperbrief des Paulus in der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (WUNT 353; Tübingen 2015) 153-168, en particulier 158. Le Bürgerrecht designe les droits civiques, lesquels comprennent les droits politiques, sociaux et civils. Les droits civiques sont ceux des citoyens libres. Ebel insiste sur le fait que les droits des croyants, de quelque origine qu'ils soient, hébreux ou non, hommes et femmes, libres et esclaves, sont célestes, là où règne le Ressuscité, et donnent la même identité et dignité à tous. À son avis, en Ph 3,20, Paul dirait plus ou moins ce qu'il dit ailleurs, par ex. en Ga 3,28.

Sans être équivalents, les termes «citoyenneté» et «Bürgerrecht» sont proches, car sans droits civiques, il n'y a pas de citoyenneté. Les traductions pour lesquelles le terme πολίτευμα désigne la constitution — les lois auxquelles sont soumis les citoyens — sont elles aussi relativement proches. En effet, pour Paul, πολίτευμα désigne un référent opposé à celui des judaïsants, à la circoncision et donc à la loi mosaïque. Et pour lui, le référent des chrétiens n'est pas la circoncision — qui fixe la πολιτεία judaïque — ou toute autre constitution, tout autre système législatif auquel ils devraient se soumettre: ce à quoi ils sont soumis se trouve dans les cieux. Comme le dit E. Ebel, «la véritable espérance et appartenance des chrétiens ne se trouve pas à Philippiques, à Rome ou dans toute autre cité terrestre, mais dans les cieux»³⁰. Cela dit, en Ph 3,18-21, l'opposition n'est pas entre cité terrestre et cieux, mais entre un *pouvoir* terrestre — le dieu ventre, autrement dit la circoncision, et par elle la loi mosaïque — et un pouvoir céleste — le πολίτευμα inséparable du Christ. En effet, les parallélismes antithétiques des v. 18-21 sont essentiels pour déterminer le sens du vocable πολίτευμα. Si les circoncis ont comme dieu leur ventre, ce dernier étant plus une métonymie qu'une synecdoque de la circoncision — autrement dit: s'ils se soumettent à des choses terrestres — le pouvoir, le πολίτευμα qui détermine la citoyenneté, l'identité et l'existence de Paul et des autres chrétiens, se trouve quant à lui dans les cieux. Ces oppositions rendent compte du vocabulaire de Ph 3,20: si le mot πολίτευμα a été ici choisi par Paul, c'est en relation au πολιτεύεσθε de 1,27, parce qu'il détermine le comportement des croyants. Quant au destin des deux groupes, il sera contraire: pour les premiers, la destruction, et pour les autres, la gloire, comme l'indique le tableau suivant:

<i>versets</i>	<i>les groupes</i>	<i>ce qui domine et gouverne</i>	<i>résultat final</i>
v. 18-19	eux (les circoncis)	leur dieu = leur ventre = les choses terrestres	leur destruction
v. 20-21	nous (la vraie circoncision)	le <i>politeuma</i> et Christ dans les cieux	notre corps glorieux

Pour l'exégète, le sens de l'*hapax* πολίτευμα est donc principalement suggéré par les oppositions sémantiques du contexte immédiat (les v. 18-21) et par l'intratextualité propre à la lettre (Ph 1,27 et 3,20): si la circoncision détermine la citoyenneté et la sujétion des judaïsants, le πολίτευμα énonce celles des autres. Voilà pourquoi il semble difficile de voir dans le πολίτευμα du v. 20 un groupe vivant au loin — ici, dans les cieux — et

³⁰ EBEL, «Unser *politeuma*», 163.

ayant sa propre organisation, comme l'attestent certaines inscriptions et textes extrabibliques ³¹. Car Paul n'entend pas dire que lui et les Philippiens forment un groupe vivant déjà dans les cieux, et ce d'autant moins qu'ils en attendent le Christ.

Résumons les principes qui justifient la lecture ici développée: le sens le plus probable du mot *πολίτευμα* en Ph 3,20 est celui qui tient compte des contrastes et des oppositions énoncés aux versets 18-21. Nous savons bien en effet que les textes bibliques fournissent le plus souvent des indices contextuels pour interpréter les paroles rares qu'ils utilisent. En outre, quoi qu'on en ait dit, le vocable décisif du v. 20 n'est pas *πολίτευμα*, mais les suivants: le point de référence des croyants n'est plus la circoncision mais le Christ, parce que lui seul pourra glorifier leur pauvre corps mortel, circoncis ou non. En bref, il serait herméneutiquement erroné de faire dépendre le sens de Ph 3,20 seulement ou principalement de celui du mot *πολίτευμα*.

CONCLUSIONS

Au début de cette relation, j'ai déclaré que l'approche théologique de l'ecclésiologie des lettres pauliniennes a pratiquement laissé la place à une approche socio-historique. Les deux parties de mon exposé, (i) l'arrière-fond socio-historique et (ii) le sens du terme *πολίτευμα* de Ph 3,20, montrent bien que, *sans s'y substituer*, l'approche socio-historique peut aider voire confirmer ou infirmer une approche théologique. Il est donc utile de connaître les conditions sociales, politiques et religieuses contemporaines des lettres de Paul, mais l'approche socio-historique ne peut ignorer les données fournies par une argumentation exégétique solide. En bref, si l'exégète a le devoir de connaître autant que possible la culture du temps et du monde dans lesquels furent écrits les premiers témoignages de l'Évangile, il doit aussi et surtout mettre à l'œuvre sa propre compétence herméneutique.

Institut Biblique Pontifical
Piazza della Pilotta 35
I-00187 Roma
jnaletti@biblico.it

Jean-Noël ALETTI

³¹ Sur les diverses désignations, pas toujours pertinentes, proposées pour le mot *πολίτευμα*, voir J.M. MODRZEJEWSKI, *Troisième livre des Maccabées* (Bible d'Alexandrie 15.3; Paris 2008) 76-82.

SUMMARY

The study of Paul's letters increasingly calls for historical and sociological research. Some recent studies have tried to show that one cannot understand the letter to the Philippians if one does not see that Paul takes a stand against the evergetism and clientelism then in vogue. Similarly, with regard to the word πολίτευμα of Phil 3,20, historians think that it is impossible to determine its meaning if one does not take into account its extrabiblical use. This article shows that while exegetes must know as much as possible about the social and historical data of the time, they must also and above all implement their own hermeneutic competence.

EINE NEUE KONJEKTUR ZU HOS 12,5

Stephen Pisano zum Gedenken

Die knappe, geradezu bis zur Unverständlichkeit komprimierte Zusammenfassung der Erzählung von Jakobs Kampf am Jabbok (Gen 32,23-33) in Hos 12,4-5 ist seit jeher umstritten: „Im Mutterleib hinterging er seinen Bruder, und in seiner Kraft kämpfte er mit Gott. Er kämpfte mit einem Engel und hielt stand, er weinte und flehte ihn an. In Bet-El suchte er ihn zu finden und dort mit ihm zu sprechen“¹. Dabei führt gerade das unerwartete Verb בכה „er weinte“ in 12,5 nach der in den Kommentaren nicht weiter hinterfragten Lesung des Masoretischen Textes vor Schwierigkeiten, und zwar aus drei unterschiedlichen Gründen².

Erstens ist im Ausgangstext von Gen 32,26-27, der, nach seiner freien Umgestaltung zu urteilen, weithin bekannt gewesen sein muss³, nirgends vom Weinen Jakobs oder seines Gegners die Rede. Deshalb fragt man sich, wo dieses Motiv, trotz seiner schon frühen Bezeugung durch den Wortlaut der Septuaginta (dort allerdings im Plural und mit Komplement der ersten statt der dritten Person beim zweiten Verb wegen der verbreiteten Verlesung von לו als לי am Ende des ersten Teils von Vers 5: ἔκλαυσαν καὶ ἐδεήθησάν μου „sie weinten und richteten eine Bitte an mich“) und der Vulgata (*flevit et rogavit eum*, nach der lateinischen Zählung 12,4), eigentlich herkommt⁴.

¹ Ich hatte das Privileg, meine Überlegungen zu Hos 12,5 vorab mit Christoph Levin besprechen zu können. Dafür sei ihm an dieser Stelle herzlich gedankt!

² Zu anderen Problemen des Textes siehe knapp H.W. WOLFF, *Dodekapropheton 1: Hosea* (BK XIV/1; Neukirchen⁴1990) 275 und ausführlicher A.A. MACINTOSH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh 2014) 483-488. Hinzu kommt der weder von WOLFF noch von MACINTOSH noch von den älteren Kommentaren erwähnte merkwürdige Wechsel ins Imperfekt trotz narrativem Kontext in der zweiten Hälfte von V. 5; diese beiden Formen sind möglicherweise konativ oder inchoativ zu verstehen (wohl ähnlich wie 1 Kön 21,6), vgl. zu solchen bislang wenig erforschten Gebrauchsweisen des Imperfekts für unbestimmte imperfektive Sachverhalte in der Vergangenheit H. GZELLA, „Non-Progressive and Non-Habitual Uses of Imperfective Aspect in Ancient Hebrew“, *Tense and Aspect in Ancient Language* (hg. M. WITTE) (KUSATU; Waltrop 2021) 71-92.

³ Bereits richtig beobachtet von J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die kleinen Propheten* (Berlin³1898) 128: „Hosea setzt hier [...] eine genaue Bekanntschaft mit den Geschichten der Genesis voraus“.

⁴ Die Übersetzung beider Verben im Plural in der Septuaginta scheint ein Verständnis zu dokumentieren, gemäß dem der Vers vermutlich auf die Nachkommen Jakobs bezogen wird. Dafür spricht auch die erste Person beim Objekt „mich“. Siehe zu der Frage W.E. GLENNY,

Zweitens ist **בכה** „weinen“ sonst kaum je als emotionale Begleiterecheinung eines spontanen Flehens bezeugt, wie es hier mit dem Hitpaal des Verbs **הגן** bezeichnet wird. Die Wurzel **בכה** begegnet üblicherweise in formalisierten Akten mit rechtlichem Charakter, vor allem bei der Totenklage und in Anklagen gegenüber Dritten (wie genau sich z.B. Gen 42,24 und 45,14-15 dazu verhalten, wäre gesondert zu klären). Das gilt auch für die auf den ersten Blick engsten Parallelen Ps 6,9-10 und Est 8,3, wo **בכה** wie in Hos 12,5 jeweils zusammen mit Formen der Wurzel **הגן** erscheint. Im Kontext von Psalm 6 entspricht jedoch die Erhöhung des Flehens des Beters der öffentlichen Rehabilitierung, wie V. 11 bestätigt. Und die Bitte Esters wird nicht zuletzt durch die Proskynese als formelles Gesuch bei einem Oberhaupt innerhalb eines — in diesem Fall ehelichen — Rechtsverhältnisses ausgewiesen, ähnlich wie die Klage des Volkes vor Mose als seinem Ernährer in Num 11,13 und die der Frau Simsons vor ihrem Mann in Ri 14,16-17⁵. In Hos 12,5 geht es aber weder um eine pflichtschuldige Totenbeweinung noch um eine Beschwerde als Folge einer als ungerecht empfundenen Behandlung⁶. Der Mangel an wirklich guten Parallelen für eine spontane Verbindung von Weinen und Bitten schließt die Lesung von MT zu Hos 12,5 zwar nicht aus, vermehrt aber die bereits durch die Traditionsgeschichte geweckten Anfangszweifel.

Zu den inhaltlichen und semantischen Einwänden gegen die Lesung **בכה** „er weinte“ in Hos 12,5 nach MT tritt, drittens, ein syntaktischer. Das asyndetische Perfekt in einer in der Vergangenheit spielenden Erzählung ließe sich am ehesten als Umstandssatz „indem er weinte“ erklären⁷. Dem steht allerdings entgegen, dass die ganz wenigen zumindest auf den ersten Blick vergleichbaren Verwendungen — die meisten sind verneinte adverbelle Bestimmungen mit der Bedeutung „ohne zu“ und von positiven Aussagen zu unterscheiden — wie 1 Kön 13,18 („er sprach

Hosea: A Commentary Based on Hosea in Codex Vaticanus (Leiden 2013) 163. Im syrischen Text dagegen fehlt bei dem auch sonst durch Komprimierung der vier Verben zu zwei deutlich verkürzten Vers der fragliche Ausdruck ganz, vgl. E.J. TULLY, *The Translation and Translator of the Peshitta of Hosea* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute 21; Leiden 2015) 197-198.

⁵ Ob an diesen letzten beiden Stellen eine eigene Nuance vorliegt, wie W. GESENIUS – R. MEYER – H. DONNER, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Berlin u.a. 182013) 148 unter Punkt 3 vermuten („durch Wehklagen belästigen“), kann hier nicht entschieden werden.

⁶ Zwar haben F.I. ANDERSEN – D.N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea* (AB 24; Garden City, NY 1980) 613-614, die Verbindung von Weinen und Bitten unter Verweis auf Est 8,3 als „plea for grace“ erkannt, aber nicht berücksichtigt, dass hier im Gegensatz zu den anderen Belegen kein formalisierter Rechtsakt vorliegt.

⁷ J. JEREMIAS, *Der Prophet Hosea* (ATD 24/1; Göttingen 1983) 154, dem das Verdienst zukommt, eine syntaktische Schwierigkeit gesehen zu haben, auf die keiner der übrigen Standardkommentare eingeht.

zu ihm, indem er ihn anlog“) oder Jer 7,26 („sie zeigten sich hartnäckig, schlimmer als ihre Väter“) doch nicht völlig identisch sind. Dort liegt nämlich keine eigene Begleithandlung vor, sondern offenbar immer eine Näherbestimmung der mit dem vorangehenden Verb ausgedrückten Handlung⁸. Indes kann בכה „weinen“ hier unmöglich als Spezifizierung des vorangehenden Verbs יכל „standhalten“ aufgefasst werden, aber bei einer separaten Begleithandlung kommt diese Konstruktion nicht vor. Zudem dürfte mit Sicherheit feststehen, dass Hos 12,4-5 zu den späten Anhängen des Hoseabuches gehört und wohl erst aus hellenistischer Zeit stammt⁹, doch fehlen für das ohnehin sehr ungewöhnliche asyndetische Perfekt als Umstandsbestimmung eindeutige nachklassische Belege. Die einzige Alternative bestünde darin, dass mit בכה eine neue, von den vorausgehenden beiden *imperfecta consecutiva* unabhängige Sequenz beginnt. Gerade angesichts der ohnehin auffälligen Variationsbreite der Verbalformen in Hos 12,1-5 insgesamt kann das wohl nicht prinzipiell ausgeschlossen werden, führte jedoch zu der neuen Schwierigkeit, dass dann nur in V. 5 der zweite Stichos asyndetisch angeschlossen würde und bei allen anderen Versen im Kontext jeweils syndetisch.

Diese Probleme wären also zwar nicht unbedingt jedes für sich unüberwindlich, legen aber kumulativ in jedem Fall nahe, dass mit der Lesung von MT trotz Unterstützung durch die alten Übersetzungen etwas nicht stimmt. Sie alle lassen sich einfach in den Griff bekommen, wenn man statt בכה *bākā* „er weinte“ בכה *bḵōḥ* „kraftvoll“ konjiziert und dies als Umstandsbestimmung zum vorangehenden Verb יכל „und er hielt stand“ zieht. Älteren Auslegern scheint das entgangen zu sein, aber als adverbialer Ausdruck kommt בכה ja gar nicht so selten vor (z.B. Ri 16,30, Sach 4,6 oder Koh 9,10, determiniert weiterhin in Jes 40,9 und um verschiedene Nomina erweitert auch in Gen 31,6, Jes 10,13, Ps 33,16, 1 Chr 29,2 und 2 Chr 26,13), und im Zusammenhang mit dem Verb יכל „standhalten, obsiegen“ tritt das Nomen כח „Kraft“ auch in Sir 5,3 auf (מי יוכל כחו) „Wer kann seiner Kraft standhalten?“¹⁰.

⁸ Prägnant beschrieben von W. GESENIUS – E. KAUTZSCH, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig 281909) §156d, auf die JEREMIAS, *Hosea*, 154 Anm. 15 verweist, aber ohne die dort ausdrücklich gemachte, auch von anderen Grammatiken übersehene wichtige Einschränkung. An ein paar weiteren Stellen wie Gen 44,12 oder Jes 5,11 folgt das Verb einem vorangestellten nominalen Ausdruck, was dann wiederum zu einem anderen Satzmuster als dem von Hos 12,5 führt.

⁹ Mit J. WÖHRLE, „Jacob, Moses, Levi. Pentateuchal Figures in the Book of the Twelve“, *The Formation of the Pentateuch* (hg. J.C. GERTZ u.a.) (FAT 111; Tübingen 2016) 997-1014, hier 1002, u.a.

¹⁰ „Seiner Kraft“ ist wohl nach dem Griechischen τίς με δυναστεύσει zu korrigieren zu „meiner Kraft“, vgl. R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin 1906) 48.

Überdies erfordert eine solche Konjekture nur einen leichten, paläographisch gut nachvollziehbaren Eingriff in den Konsonantentext, zumal mit Verschreibungen von ח zu ה wie auch dem Umkehrfall durchaus zu rechnen ist ¹¹. Dadurch entsteht dann am Ende zusätzlich ein Parallelismus mit dem synonymen adverbialen Ausdruck באונו „in seinem Vermögen“ in 12,4, der in der Verbindung von אונים und כח in Jes 40,26 (in derselben Reihenfolge) ein exaktes Gegenstück hat ¹². Irrtümliches בכה könnte im Laufe der Überlieferung leicht unter Einfluss der Verbindung mit der Wurzel חנן wie in Ps 6,9-10 entstanden sein, auch wenn der Kontext dort ein ganz anderer ist.

Die Ambivalenz wird dadurch zwar nicht aufgelöst, weil sich aus der Formulierung von Hos 12,5 immer noch nicht hinreichend deutlich ergibt, ob es Jakob ist, der fleht (wenn mit MT בכה zu lesen und als Umstandssatz zu erklären ist, kann das Subjekt nur das gleiche sein wie das des vorangehenden Verbs (ויכל), oder sein Gegner ¹³. Aber das dürfte auch gar nicht in der Absicht des Redaktors gelegen haben, als er die Erzählung vom Jakobs Kampf auf wenige Satzbrocken ohne durchlaufenden Handlungs-gang zusammenstutzte. Tilgt man durch die Korrektur von בכה zu בכח das Motiv des Weinens, wäre zumindest bei Jakob als Subjekt aller Verben in der ersten Vershälfte der Anschluss an ויתחנן-לו etwas glatter, vor allem dann, wenn man bei חנן hier nicht die Nuance „flehen“, sondern eher „demütig bitten“ ansetzt, durchaus im Sinne des griechischen Pendantς δέομαι in der Septuaginta ¹⁴. Warum Jakob als Sieger weinen soll,

¹¹ Eine Reihe möglicher Fälle findet sich bei F. DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament* (Berlin – Leipzig 1920) §106a-c.

¹² Dieser Parallelismus wäre auch dann nicht ausgeschlossen, wenn man mit K. MARTI, *Das Dodekapropheton* (KHAT 13; Tübingen 1904) 94, und, weniger ausdrücklich, L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL – J.L. SICRE DÍAZ, *I Profeti* (Rom ³1996) 1036, באונו in 4b primär als Gegensatz zu בבטן „im Mutterleib“ in 4a auffasst. Dabei ist freilich zu bedenken, dass און im Sinne von „Alter der Geschlechtsreife“ ein singulärer Ausdruck ist, da das Wort sonst immer nur die Kraft (einschließlich der Zeugungskraft) selbst bezeichnet, aber nie die Lebensphase, in der sie entsteht. Auch in dem einzigen kontrastierenden Parallelismus, in dem es belegt ist, fungiert און in negierter Form אין אונים „Kraftlose“ wiederum als Gegenstück von כח „Kraft“ (Jes 40,29). Im weiteren Kontext der Verse 4 und 5 entspräche also eine (weitere) Zuordnung von און und כח einem unabhängig von Hosea 12 belegten und semantisch ohnehin naheliegenden Wortpaar. Zusätzlich zum Kontrast zu בבטן bildete באונו so eine Art Parallelismus ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.

¹³ Für die erste Lösung entscheiden sich MARTI, *Dodekapropheton*, 95, W.R. HARPER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 381, E. SELLIN, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch* (KAT 12; Leipzig ^{2/3}1929) 122, JEREMIAS, *Hosea*, 153-154, und MACINTOSH, *Hosea*, 485; für die zweite, von der Mehrheitsmeinung abweichend, M.I. GRUBER, *Hosea: A Textual Commentary* (New York 2017) 500, doch ohne Begründung. Sie alle übernehmen MT. Der Plural der Verben in der Septuaginta bezeugt, wie anfangs bemerkt, wohl eine über den Text hinausgehende Interpretation.

¹⁴ Siehe die Belege bei T. MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain 2009) 143 („to ask humbly for help“).

erforderte in jedem Fall über den Text hinausgehende Zusatzhypothesen ¹⁵. Aber dass er nach seinem kraftvollen Sieg den übernatürlichen Gegner zur Mehrung der eigenen Stärke um dessen Segen bittet, sich das Flehen also auf Gen 32,27 bezieht, ist aus der ursprünglichen Fassung der Erzählung unmittelbar abzuleiten. Gleichwohl lässt der Text prinzipiell die Möglichkeit eines Subjektwechsels offen, bei dem das Flehen dann die Bitte des Gegners in Gen 32,26 meint, ihn bei Tagesanbruch loszulassen ¹⁶.

Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1
D-80539 München, Deutschland
holger.gzella@lmu.de

Holger GZELLA

SUMMARY

The reading בכה “(while) he wept” in Hos 12,5 according to the Masoretic Text is suspicious on grounds of contents, semantics, and syntax: this reaction is unattested in the underlying story of Jacob’s struggle with his opponent at the Jabbok in Gen 32,26-27; weeping in general occurs predominantly in ritual, or at least ritualized, and in legal contexts in the Hebrew Bible; and there are no convincing parallels for an asyndetic perfect that denotes another action concomitant with but different from the one depicted by the main verb. The easiest solution of all these problems would be to correct MT’s reading of the verb בכה to the adverbial expression בכח “forcefully”, which is paleographically easy, idiomatically impeccable, and contextually satisfactory.

¹⁵ Dazu vgl. WOLFF, *Hosea*, 275.

¹⁶ Laut SELLIN, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 122, wäre bei einem Subjektwechsel das Pronomen הוא zu erwarten, doch das dürfte nicht zwingend nötig sein, wie z.B. Gen 6,4, 9,27 oder 15,6 zeigen: „rascher Subjectswechsel ist häufig“, bemerkte schon E. KÖNIG, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, Band 3 (Leipzig 1897) §399ß.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Mark A. AWABDY, *A Commentary on Leueitikon in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series). Leiden, Brill, 2020. xv-475 p. 16 × 24. €154,00

The book is the fourteenth volume published in the Brill series of commentaries on the LXX. A similar series is being undertaken by the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS), the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint, but the two projects follow different principles. While the SBL series uses the text of the best critical edition for each biblical book as its base, the Brill series focuses on the text of a specific manuscript. In most cases, as in the commentary on Leviticus, the chosen witness is Codex Vaticanus (B), though, for some books, the commentary follows Codex Sinaiticus or Codex Alexandrinus.

This volume contains a long and very well-written introduction explaining the textual situation of the LXX of Leviticus and the principles guiding Awabdy's work. When referring to the differences between his work and the principles guiding Büchner's commentary on Leviticus for the SBL series (still in preparation), Awabdy tries to justify this volume's place in relation to the latter and to J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLCS 44; Atlanta, GA 1997). Unlike the SBL commentary, Awabdy does not adopt the interlinear model behind NETS. An important observation is that the commentary on Codex Vaticanus is not offered as a criticism or as an alternative to the studies and editions that focus on a critical text of LXX-Leviticus. Instead, it is intended as a different contribution to the field of Septuagint studies, namely, the analysis of the textual form of a single witness. Therefore, the editor makes clear that the volume is not a commentary on the OG of LXX-Leviticus. Awabdy does not deny the theories suggesting that 4QLXXLev^a and 4QpapLXXLev^b represent an older Greek text than the text of B, an idea opposed to the one espoused in the past by Wevers, the editor of the Göttingen edition. Even while not being identical to the OG, B is a most important witness to LXX-Leviticus and deserves to be treated at length. Although the focus is on B because of the quality of this witness and its agreements with other Greek witnesses, the volume becomes a commentary on the majority of LXX-Leviticus in most cases.

Awabdy presents the reader with the uncorrected text of Codex Vaticanus. In order to do so, he has emended Swete's text (*The Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint*. I. Genesis – IV Kings [Cambridge 1909]), also based on B, in 263 places, thus departing from Swete's tendency to prefer the text of a corrector or of another witness. A list of these changes is given in the introduction, but the emendations are also indicated in the apparatus to the Greek text where they occur. A similar list of the differences between Awabdy's text and the one

in Wevers' edition is lacking but would have been equally helpful. In any case, there is a conscious choice to present a text known to be imperfect, a text that remains faithful to the reality of the manuscript. However, the errors spotted in B are discussed in the commentary.

The Greek text is accompanied by an English translation on the facing pages. The editor provides a long explanation of the principles adopted in his English translation of B. The translation offered intentionally privileges formal equivalence, and, despite the similarities with NETS, it more often allows unclear syntax or nonsensical renderings of the source text to surface in English. I understand and support Awabdy's general principle of representing nonsensical expressions and the awkwardness that the readers of B would have recognized in its text. Some of them are also found in NETS, such as "by death be put to death" in Lev 20,10, or "bed of semen" in Lev 15,16. However, it is difficult to understand some translation choices, like the unnecessary "pure olive oil of olives" in Lev 24,2.

In order to understand the interpretative setting of B's Leviticus, Awabdy takes into account the patristic authors at the time of the production of the codex and shows how the authors of that period read Leviticus. Since B is a witness of both the OT and the NT, Awabdy also comments on the NT quotations from Leviticus. Furthermore, already in the introduction he shows how widely Leviticus' cult motif was received into the NT in themes like purification and dedication sacrifices, the temple, priesthood, propitiation, purity, holiness, and so on.

A section of the introduction is devoted to the history of Codex Vaticanus with a discussion of its possible origins and also some technical information about the manuscript. In discussing the textual character of B, the author reminds the reader that the text-type of B changes from book to book in the OT. The similarity between B and A (Codex Alexandrinus) in LXX-Leviticus is also underscored. Awabdy displays a good awareness of the state of research regarding *kaige* and other phenomena that prevent us from treating B as identical to the OG. Furthermore, he correctly warns against the use of categories of NT textual criticism such as "Alexandrian text-type" for the text of Leviticus.

The introduction also discusses the text divisions of the manuscript, which differ from the divisions found in the critical editions. They are presented in a table in the introduction (34-42) and are noted in the commentary as well. Awabdy's attention to text divisions is commendable since they already represent an understanding of the text. The paragraph divisions of the Greek text in the volume are those found in B. The impact of text division on interpretation can be seen, for example, in the commentary on Lev 2,7-13 (194).

A helpful discussion of the translation technique of LXX-Leviticus is included in the introduction. According to Awabdy, the translation technique of LXX-Leviticus tends more toward literalism, notwithstanding the presence of free translations. The fact that LXX-Leviticus shows divergences from the MT, sometimes agreeing with the Samaritan Pentateuch or the Qumran material, leads Awabdy to conclude that the *Vorlage* of the Greek translation was not of a proto-MT type.

Awabdy explains the position of Leviticus at the centre of the collection of the Pentateuch and observes how the Greek translators borrowed pagan religious vocabulary to describe the Israelite cult and religion. The continuous use of these expressions throughout the Pentateuch or the Hexateuch is noted, but so are the expressions in LXX-Leviticus that contrast with the other legal material in the

LXX of the Pentateuch. Awabdy explains that Leviticus should not be divided into two parts (1–16 and 17–26), a fashionable position among scholars. Rather, according to Awabdy's analysis of superscriptions and subscriptions and of the narrative framework of the book, the structure of Leviticus is quadripartite (1–7; 8–17; 18–26; 27).

The Greek text of Leviticus is given with an apparatus whose entries are referenced to the line of the Greek text they relate to, not to the verse number. In the apparatus the editor records the differences between B and other important witnesses and the critical editions of LXX-Leviticus (Swete, Brooke-McLean, and Göttingen), giving their Greek text without diacritics. The apparatus frequently shows differences between B and A, F (Codex Ambrosianus), and the correctors of B. Less often it also shows the differences from the other majuscules and the minuscules. The apparatus also includes codicological and paleographical notes on B, dealing with text division, other ancient translations, ancient authors and other relevant text-critical information.

The commentary does not follow the Greek text and its English translation immediately; instead, it is located in a different section of the volume forcing the reader to go back and forth, an unfortunate editorial choice for the series, as already pointed out by reviewers of previous volumes (e.g., M. Rösel's review of the volume on Micah, ZAW 128 [2016] 337). In the commentary, Awabdy treats many but not all of the differences between B and Wevers's text in the Göttingen edition. The commentary tries to show what readers of B might have understood or failed to comprehend in the Greek text. Despite pointing to differences between LXX-Leviticus and MT-Leviticus (especially when supported by the Qumran texts and/or the Samaritan Pentateuch), the commentary is not focused on them, something that we might see more often in the SBL series. The commentary is particularly rich in discussions of Greek syntax, such as verbal aspects and modality, marked vs. unmarked order in sentences, and so on. Awabdy is also very attentive to lexicography, drawing the reader's attention to neologisms, the use of technical terms, calques and other phenomena. The presence of figures of speech in the Greek text is also highlighted, and the commentary is attentive to the loss and creation of wordplays in the translation. Awabdy also discusses the mistranslations in B and errors derived from scribal mistakes. However, the presence of an error does not necessarily imply incomprehensibility, and Awabdy tries to show how new meanings emerged in those cases. Other exegetical considerations find less space in the commentary, though Awabdy occasionally expands his discussion, showing good awareness and intuitions concerning, for example, narrative analysis and reader-response criticism. The volume is completed with a bibliography and indexes of modern authors, subjects, biblical citations and ancient sources.

The book is clearly the product of much effort. Awabdy's work in gathering and competently analyzing all the wealth of information found in this commentary deserves due appreciation. Unfortunately, more than a few typographical errors remain in the published volume. Although I miss wider treatments of major themes in the commentary, I believe its focus on the linguistic phenomena of the Greek text was correctly chosen and well executed; otherwise the work would have had to repeat much of what commentaries focused on MT-Leviticus already say. The study of one important witness, such as Codex Vaticanus, is to be welcomed, and, although the volume does not supplant other works on LXX-Leviticus, as explained above, it certainly offers a helpful and original contribution to the

field of Septuagint studies. It will certainly become a reference book for future generations in the study of LXX-Leviticus.

Via Tuscolana, 613
00174 Roma

Leonardo PESSOA DA SILVA PINTO

H. VALLANÇON, *Le développement des traditions sur Élie et l'histoire de la formation de la Bible* (Études Bibliques. Nouvelle Série 80). Leuven, Peeters, 2019. xxviii-589 p. 16 × 24. €89,00

The traditions of Elijah stretch from the narratives in 1–2 Kings into the NT and apocalyptic literature and onto the Passover table in the cup of Elijah today. Many of the post biblical Jewish traditions were gathered by L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 6 Vols. (Philadelphia ¹²1968), first published between 1909 and 1938. More recently M.M. Caspi and G. Neu-Sokol have explored the Elijan traditions in Judaism, Christianity and Islam (*By the Soft Lyres. The Search for the Prophet Elijah* [Berlin 2006]). Many scholars focus on the reception of the Elijah cycle in specific historical periods, such as M. Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament. Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum* (Berlin 1997). Vallançon focuses on the Hellenistic, Hasmonean and early New Testament periods in order to discover what the reception of the Elijan traditions can reveal about the formation of the Bible.

The volume is divided into two major parts. The first part focuses on the Elijan traditions in particular books of the Old Testament and how they can illuminate the formation of the Hebrew text in the proto-Masoretic period. Vallançon reviews the text of the Elijah cycle and then proceeds to consider how its elements are replayed in later biblical literature of the Hellenistic period, such as the books of Jonah, Malachi, and Ben Sira. The Elijah cycle according to the LXX is also carefully examined. For the Hasmonean period, Vallançon considers Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, rabbinic literature, Pseudo-Philo, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The second part of the book treats Elijan traditions within the context of the formation of the New Testament.

A general introduction reviews broad questions about the formation of the Bible and offers an overview of the mention of Elijah's name in the OT and NT. Vallançon also reviews the history of exegetical interpretation beginning with Martin Noth, focusing on the relationship between the Elijah cycle and the Deuteronomistic history. Particular attention is given to the relationship between the MT and LXX. The assumption is that the LXX represents an older form of the Elijah cycle and that later literary developments in the Elijah story appear in the MT. Two passages are carefully examined: 1 Kgs 19,9-18 and 2 Kgs 2,1-18. The presentation of each text is followed by extensive text-critical notes and by a discussion of how both the LXX and the MT present coherent narratives. The author adheres to recent advances in textual criticism that take into account the literary developments in all the versions, including the MT. This approach to textual criticism is reflected in the *BHQ*'s characterization "lit" (= literary) in its apparatus that signals to the user that divergent readings in the versions reflect two different literary traditions and that no reading can be preferred over the others.

Vallançon's premise that the LXX presents an older version of the Elijah cycle than the MT generally holds true, but each case needs to be considered individually. The enigmatic קהל דממה דקה in the MT appears in the LXX as φωνὴ αὔρας λεπτῆς, κακεῖ κύριος (1 Kgs 19,12). Vallançon has to argue that the scribes of the MT deleted κακεῖ κύριος in order to amplify "la puissance d'évocation poétique de la formule énigmatique" (41). However, it is much more likely that κακεῖ κύριος is an explanatory gloss in the LXX, and Vallançon could have responded to the majority of biblical scholars who hold this position (see, for example, M. Cogan, *I Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 10; New Haven, CT – London 2008] 453: "Some LXX MSS add pedantically, 'YHWH is there'"). Guiding principles about the relationship between particular versions can be helpful but not in every case.

The author inserts homiletic insights into his academic argument. When Elijah enters the cave on Mount Horeb (1 Kgs 19,9.13), Vallançon comments: "Mais Dieu ne se lasse jamais et poursuit l'homme jusque dans les lieux les plus reculés où il le fuit" (41). I am not sure the biblical text suggests that Elijah was trying to hide from God as much as from Jezebel, but Vallançon's spiritual insight spurs the reader to further reflection.

After this thorough study of the biblical text, Vallançon considers the Elijah traditions in the Hellenistic period, focusing on the role of Elijah in Malachi, Jubilees, Ben Sira and in noncanonical apocalyptic literature. How are the Elijah stories replayed in these later books at the "clôture du canon des Écritures" (147)? Elijah becomes an eschatological figure. The chapter on the traditions on Elijah during the Hasmonean period examines the mention of Elijah by the dying Mattathias (1 Macc 2,58). Like Mal 3,23-24, this passage also underscores Elijah's eschatological role. He also considers the function of Elijah in First Enoch and Qumran literature (which Vallançon believes links the Elijah cycle with the Essenes) along with Targum Pseudo Jonathan and the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. Though he recognizes the late date of these latter texts, he could have considered more recent studies on this problematic question (see, for example, P.V.M. Flesher – B. Chilton, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction* [Waco, TX 2011] 163-166). The Targums contain earlier material from the Hasmonean period but most of their traditions are much later and the earlier traditions are often difficult to isolate.

This extensive review of the literature serves to illustrate that the literary developments in the Elijah traditions in later biblical books and extra biblical literature are mirrored in the literary developments in the emerging proto-MT. The MT contains literary developments that reflect later Hasmonean themes whereas the LXX does not. For example, Vallançon argues that sections of the "Songs for the Sabbath Sacrifice" (4Q405) "sont une poésie liturgique entièrement formée à partir de קהל דממה דקה" (245). The book of Jonah shows clear parallels with the Elijah cycle preserved in the LXX, which again proves that the MT has undergone further literary development. This data allows Vallançon to conclude that the Elijah cycle was inserted into the books of Kings during the Hellenistic period. During the Hasmonean period the Hebrew text underwent still further development: "En enveloppant son texte-source dans une forme apocalyptique, l'édition proto-massorétique lui confère une ampleur atemporelle ou plutôt pan-temporelle" (267). He observes that at Sinai, God wrote on tablets, but at Horeb God wrote on Elijah's heart, another homiletic remark that might go further than the biblical text allows.

Vallançon then turns to the NT. Because Elijah was an important figure in Second Temple Judaism, his appearance in the NT is expected. He admits that exploring Elijan traditions to reveal the textual development of the NT is particularly challenging. He casts a wide net for identifying Elijan traditions in the NT, including explicit citations, “*évocations*”, typological allusions, and motifs. The last category considers instances where Elijan themes appear in the MT without the specific mention of Elijah’s name. In general, he follows M. Öhler’s volume cited above. He then attempts to identify the developments in the Elijan tradition in relationship to NT Christology.

The results of this examination of all the Elijan passages in the NT reveal the diverse ways that Elijah is presented. Sometimes he is the eschatological prophet from Mal 3,23-24 (Matt 11,7-18), and other times he is just a prophet among others. Jas 5,17 replays Elijah as a model of faith. In Luke 4,25-27 Elijah and Elisha merely illustrate Jesus’ statement, “no prophet is accepted in the prophet’s hometown” (Luke 4,24). This data is then used to describe the strata of development of the Elijan traditions that in turn disclose the formation of the NT. Vallançon also reviews the search for the historical Jesus and the criteria for isolating the *ipsissima verba Iesu*.

The Elijan traditions impacted on NT Christology especially in the relationship between Jesus and John the Baptist. John is Elijah who in turn is the forerunner of the eschatology that is accomplished in Jesus. Thus, the highest Christology in the Gospel is not a process of later interpretation but reflects a literal interpretation of Mark’s prologue: “lorsque Jésus reconnaît en Jean l’Élie eschatologique, précurseur de Dieu qui entre dans son temple (Mt 3,1) et vient pour juger (Mt 3,24), il se comprend lui-même comme Dieu dans le monde” (482). I have to admit, I found the argumentation leading up to this conclusion a bit complex.

The conclusion introduces new arguments about the literal and allegorical interpretations of scripture and the unity of the Bible. The apocalyptic themes that were introduced into the Elijah cycle during the emergence of the proto-MT were also operating in the emerging text of the NT. Vallançon surmises that it is the Elijah cycle and its later reception in Hellenistic and Hasmonean periods in the OT and then its reception in the NT that unifies the Bible as a single book in two testaments.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Piazza della Pilotta 35
00187 Rome

Craig E. MORRISON

Sonja FELDMAR, *Eschatologische Fortschreibungen im Buch Hiob* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 111). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2019. xiii-316 p. 15.5 × 23. €89,00

Christian traditions have long read the biblical Book of Job as an Old Testament witness to post-mortem resurrection. The book still retains this significance — especially Job 14 and 19, for instance, which are used in funeral liturgies. However, most biblical scholars agree that the Book of Job views the individual’s restoration as happening in this world. Why, then, did an eschatological reading come so naturally to early Christian writers?

Sonja Feldmar argues that their interpretations were not wholly unfounded. While the first drafts of Job were indeed anchored in the belief that the underworld — Sheol — was not a desirable place to go and was out of G-d's reach, later "eschatological" additions interspersed the text with a different theology. While these traces were few and subtle, later translations and interpretations followed them and finally entered the eschatological realm.

Feldmar developed her thesis as a doctoral dissertation at the Goethe-Universität Frankfurt (Germany). She later reworked and expanded it by supplementing it with a chapter on the history of literary motives. She builds upon the works of Markus Witte, Daniela Opel, and Theresia Mende, who had already identified several verses in the Job speeches as eschatological glosses (*Fortschreibungen*), such as 14,12b and 29,18-20, which express the protagonist's hope for resurrection as an individual, and 19,28.29a**β**; 31,11-12.23.28, which allude to a universal judgment at the end of or beyond time.

Feldmar updates this redaction history and adds specific dating. According to her results, one redactor would have added Job 19,28-29 and 31,11-12.14.23.28 in the middle of the second century BCE, introducing the idea of a final judgment for the wicked. At the end of the second century or at the beginning of the first century BCE, other redactors would have inscribed the notion of a resurrection for Job as an individual into 14,12a**β** and of a universal resurrection into 29,18-20.

After a twelve-page introduction to the research question, Feldmar immediately delves into philological analyses of chapters 14, 19, 29, and 31 (Parts I–IV). In each of these sections, she gives a thorough yet concise analysis of the Hebrew text, employing all the relevant tools of the historical-critical method: text criticism, the source-critical identification of possible *Fortschreibungen* — eschatological or not — a metric analysis, and a semantic analysis of key eschatological terms.

She then examines how the versions read those *Fortschreibungen*. She delves extensively into the Septuagint, with which she includes both the Old Greek Job and the asterisked material. She treats the Vulgate, the Qumran targum, and the rabbinic targum more concisely and includes Hebrew fragments from Qumran whenever possible.

In an extensive fifth section, the author examines the tradition history of several eschatological motifs: the redeemer (19,25), the sword (19,28-29), the phoenix (29,18), the sleep of death (14,12), and the perishing and recreation of the heavens (14,12a**β**). The author also enlarges upon motifs that, according to her, were borrowed from the Egyptian Book of the Dead: the weighing of the heart (31,6), the Devourer of the Dead (31,12), the lake of fire (31,12), and the role of Osiris (Job 31). A short summary and concluding chapter wrap up the arguments, followed by the usual registers at the end of the book.

This monograph bridges the gap between the eschatological horizon to which most of the Old Testament scriptures attest and the eschatology contained in later Old and New Testament scriptures, as well as in other literature from the Second Temple period. It tries to answer the question of how the eschatological beliefs of a universal judgment at the end of time, the individual judgment at the end of an individual's life, and the happy afterlife entered Jewish texts and belief systems. Feldmar traces one possible route in the Book of Job and claims that later redactions and translations read ambiguous passages as unequivocally eschatological assertions, thus giving the book a new direction without suppressing the passages

that offer an alternative view. She thus shows the potential of source and redaction criticism to outline the development of religious ideas.

Her book follows a clear and logical structure and employs a precise and concise language. It offers a textbook example of the historical-critical methodology, with nuanced arguments and carefully weighed pros and cons without lazy shortcuts or hasty conclusions. The author acknowledges possible objections, deals with them seriously, and refutes them sensibly, while firmly presenting her standpoints and supporting them with plausible arguments and datings.

The strongest parts of the book are the semantic analyses, in which she shows how theological buzzwords develop and carry shifts of meaning. For instance, she shows how the verb קום-G carries no eschatological connotation in the older layers of the text of Job 14,12a: "And a human lies down and does not rise again (וְלֹא-יָקוּם)". However, later redactors read it as a theologically evocative notion and built new eschatological layers on this semantic stepping stone by adding: "Until there are no more heavens, they will not awake" (עַד-בְּלֹתִי שָׁמַיִם לֹא יָקִיצוּ). It is this addition, Feldmar argues, that has led to the wide reception and liturgical relevance of Job 14.

While this brief example illustrates the potentials of the study, it also highlights its difficulties. A question simmers throughout the entire book: how far can you go in terms of source and redaction criticism, especially when it comes to poetic texts that are meant to be multi-faceted and open to different interpretations? Feldmar herself acknowledges the precariousness of some of her arguments. She classifies the eschatological content of the additions as consciously implicit, hardly recognizable (269) and as something that could be easily overlooked (278). However, if this holds true, the researcher could just as easily read these theological tendencies into the text. Additionally, these attenuating phrases of the author stand in stark contrast to bold statements, according to which קץ-H in Job 14,12 referred "unequivocally" (*eindeutig*) to a resurrection in the afterlife (36) or that Job 29,18-20 "unequivocally" contained eschatological motives (127). Strangely enough, her respective discussions do not warrant such clear-cut conclusions.

Nevertheless, the discussions themselves follow a sound methodology. More difficult are the chapters that deal with the Septuagint translations of the supposed eschatological passages. The author recognizes that the MT presents numerous difficulties for contemporary readers as well as for ancient translators (87). However, when discussing specific Old Greek (OG) Job translations, she does not depart from the default assumption that the translators tried to convey the Hebrew to the best of their knowledge while simultaneously providing an intelligible and appealing Greek text.

However, she starts off by claiming that the LXX testified to an eschatological reading of the MT text and that this was a common scholarly assumption. This is manifestly not the case. The claim can be traced back to H.S. Gehman and D.H. Gard, two scholars that Feldmar cites, but they have been strongly contested, most notably by H.M. Orlinsky ("Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job III (Continued). B. Anthropopathisms", *HUCA* 32 [1961] 239-268). The author makes no mention of this controversy, so perhaps she is not even aware of it. Unfortunately, this is evident in her treatment of the Old Greek Job passages in question, where she repeats the mistakes of earlier Septuagint studies.

One example should suffice to prove the point. When it comes to Job 14,12a, she asserts that, by translating קום-G with ἀνίστημι, the OG Job translator inserts the *terminus technicus* for the resurrection into the Greek text (41). However,

ἀνίστημι is the standard equivalent for קוּם-G throughout the LXX translations, as a simple examination of the Hatch-Redpath-Concordance will prove. Therefore, Feldmar's assertion that OG Job reflects an eschatological understanding of the MT stands on shaky grounds.

Apart from these major concerns, there are some minor points to be made. There are only two introductory pages on the research of eschatology and apocalyptic texts (9-11), but this is the central topic of the book! While the author is right in not overloading the introduction, a short overview of the recent research would have been desirable, especially for definitions, classifications, and common research questions.

In some instances, Sonja Feldmar offers problematic translations. For instance, she translates the Egyptian mythological Benu bird with "phoenix" (*Phönix*, 243-244), immediately after discussing how several scholars contest the equation of the Benu with the phoenix (240-242). This culminates in the final assertion that the Egyptian tradition would represent the dead as "phoenixes" (249). While this probably represents a lapse, it is nevertheless irksome.

Some other inconsistencies or problematic methodologies can be mentioned in passing. For her analyses, the author relies on the "chapter", a historically contingent division, for delimiting her textual base while stating that she bases her studies on the "literary unit" (11). At one place she terms the "root" קִיץ a *hapax legomenon* even while affirming in the very next line that the "notion" (*Begriff*) קִיץ is used in other parts of the Old Testament (272) and discussing the different uses of קִיץ in an earlier chapter (34-37). She attributes the asterisked material to Origen (41-42), even though he was actually the compiler of different translations and probably took the asterisked material from Theodotus (according to P.J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* [Atlanta, GA 1995]).

However, these drawbacks should not detract from the general value of Feldmar's book. Those who support her methodological premises will find an excellent example of its application. It enlightens readers on how a specific strand of German exegesis works. Those who do not share her premises will, nevertheless, find a meticulous study of these difficult passages. Many might not agree with Feldmar's conclusions; however, they should engage with her arguments and refute them with better hypotheses. This book can and should ignite scholarly debate and will be beneficial for everyone interested both in the Book of Job and in the history of eschatological beliefs in Judaism and Christianity.

Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Sankt Georgen e. V. Juliane ECKSTEIN
Offenbacher Landstr. 224
60599 Frankfurt am Main
juliane.eckstein@sankt-georgen.de

Helga VÖLKENING, *Imago Dei versus Kultbild*. Die Sapientia Salomonis als jüdisch-hellenistischer Beitrag zur antiken Bilderdebatte (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 508). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2019. xi-555 p. 16 × 23.5. €99,95.

This stimulating work argues for thematic coherence in Wisdom as a whole. It is also a study in theology and piety as they are mirrored in Wisdom. Conflict between

imago Dei and the images venerated in gentile cult is presented as the book's principal theme (*Hauptthema*). In Wisdom, it is argued, "adequate" images of God — the human creation, an *eikon* of God's "self" or "particularity" (2,23, reading *idiotetos*, 388), and divine wisdom, an *eikon* of God's goodness (7,26) — are rivalled by "inadequate" ones, the idols criticized, with use of *eikon* among other terms, in chapters 13–15. Helga Völkening urges that ethical exhortation, sometimes underrated by interpreters, is the main purpose (*Haupttenor*) of Wisdom throughout. Within this exhortation, she suggests, the imitation of God (12,19, by his works he taught his people that the righteous should be *philanthropos*) is shown, through narration of his works in Wisdom 11–19, to form the needed response to idolatry: a realization of the image of God in humanity (2,23), through attention to his image in heavenly wisdom (7,26), and to divine law and commandment (as in 6,10.18–19).

The book is based on the author's Potsdam dissertation of 2016, written under the guidance of K.E. Grözinger. He is thanked *inter alia* for constantly rekindling the concern with rabbinic as well as Jewish-Hellenistic literature which is an attractive feature of the work. Within study of the Wisdom of Solomon, the book is somewhat comparable with Moyna McGlynn, *Divine Judgment and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom* (WUNT 2.139; Tübingen 2001). Wis 11,15 – 15,19, on divine judgment and gentile idolatry, expands the first of seven contrasts between Egyptians and Israelites (11,1–14; 16,1 – 19,22). McGlynn studied 11,15 – 12,27, and highlighted the concord of this part with themes of Wisdom as a whole. Helga Völkening considers 13,1 – 15,19, and finds that the question of an adequate representation of God, which emerges here, forms a key to the understanding of the whole book. In linking Wisdom 13–15 with 2,23 and 7,26 she notes her closeness to Stefanie Lorenzen, *Das paulinische Eikon-Konzept. Semantische Analysen zur Sapientia Salomonis, zu Philo und den Paulusbriefen* (WUNT 2.250; Tübingen 2008).

Helga Völkening seeks to show that, although references to *imago Dei* in Wisdom are scattered and allusive outside chapters 13–15, this theme is implicit throughout. Thus the virtue which marks the righteous in Wisdom 1–6 corresponds to that attributed to God himself as exemplar in chapters 11–19; keeping of the laws confirms the incorruption (implied when we were made in the image of God, 2,23) which makes us near to God (6,18–19); and the divine image in humanity is implied in the human calling to rule the world in holiness and righteousness (9,2–3).

The Wisdom of Solomon as a whole thus appears here as "a Jewish-Hellenistic contribution to the debate on images in antiquity", to quote the sub-title. In this debate, Helga Völkening shows, the cultic rôles of images of gods, heroes, philosophers, and rulers, together with related legends and philosophical interpretations (*Bildtheologien*), are confronted by critics in the philosophical and biblical traditions. The contribution of the book of Wisdom to the debate lies, it is suggested, not only in the fusion of biblical and philosophical critique in 13–15, but also in the presentation of *Sophia* as an image not subject to the inadequacies of the *Kultbild*, and the matching inculcation of recovery of the divine image in humanity by *imitatio Dei*. The Wisdom of Solomon is then seen to develop the association of *Bildkritik* with ethical exhortation which is found in Hebrew scripture, and to anticipate Clement of Alexandria and Origen on ethical life and *imitatio Dei* as the way to recover a true *imago Dei*, in contrast with idolatry. The thematic importance of single allusions (as in 2,23; 7,26; 12,19) is indeed largely implicit, even when they are viewed together with broader but still mainly implicit depictions of

response to a divine exemplar, but these implications would have been recognized in reception, it is suggested (496-7), because image-veneration and its discussion were so prominent in the Hellenistic world.

Yet it can perhaps still be asked whether there is enough emphasis and inter-connection to permit the discernment of discourse on *imago Dei*, reinforced by inculcation of *imitatio Dei*, as the unifying *Hauptthema*. To consider first *imago Dei*, in 2,23 and 7,26 it is mentioned, but it seems subordinate in each case to the main contextual concern (the immortality of the righteous, and wisdom's share in many divine attributes, respectively); wisdom, the image of divine goodness (7,26), passes into holy souls (7,27), but produces not precisely "likeness" to God, but "friends of God, and prophets" (cf. 6,18 "near to God", rather than "like God"). In 13-15 an explicit critique of images is indeed developed, but without express link or contrast with *imago Dei* in humanity (2,23) or wisdom (7,26), even when the argument might suggest it (15,17). It is certainly significant for interpretation that views of the Wisdom of Solomon as a whole can discern *imago Dei* as a theme and find the implicit approaches to it noted above, but, in the absence of any more explicit internal linkage of image-language subordinated to individual contexts, can this theme be regarded as the *Hauptthema*?

For *imitatio Dei*, passages taken to imply it are indeed not far from the thought of human imitation of God, but they fall strikingly short of expressing it. Thus 12,19, perhaps the most important text for the presentation here, in its context forms not an exhortation to imitate God but an example of the paternal divine admonition which is Israel's privilege (11,10). While this statement is indeed followed, as Völkening notes, by 12,22, urging directly that we should "remember" God's goodness (cf. 7,26) when we make judgments, the remembrance of God (Deut 8,18; Tob 4,5), rather than the imitation of God, is the biblical theme which is brought to the fore.

Earlier in the book, Wis 4,2 ("they" [human beings] "imitate her" [virtue]) does indeed expressly mention imitation, but the contextual concern is the consolation for childlessness which is provided by the practice of virtue, imitated when present and desired when it has departed. The memory left by the dead (4,1) seems more clearly in view than *imitatio Dei*. Wis 6,10 (they who holily keep holy things — *ta hosia*, probably the divine precepts — shall be made holy) comes, with 6,18-19, as already noted, nearer to exhortation than to *imitatio*. In 6,10 the assonance of the adjective *hosios* and the cognate verb and adverb recalls the repetition of *hagios* in classic texts for *imitatio Dei*, Lev 11,44-5; 19,2; 20,26 LXX (be holy, for I am holy), as is noted here. Yet, again, the thought in Wis 6,10 is not exactly that of *imitatio*, but, as the reverential passive suggests, of God as imputing or imparting holiness to those who keep his commandments. None of these passages, then, shows anything like the unhesitating hortatory use of "imitators of God" in Eph 5,1 or Ignatius, *Eph.* 1.1, *Trall.* 1.2.

Hearers or readers have in any case still to connect these passages with the theme of the image of God. They are helped, perhaps, when 6,10 is soon followed by 6,18, on incorruption, and 12,19 by 12,23-27, and then by chapters 13-15, on idolatry; yet in 15,5-6 desire for a beautiful image is indeed lampooned, but (by contrast with Philo, *Decal.* 73, in this connection, quoted by Völkening) there is no express contrast with the good desire to become like the true God, and imitation is not expressly brought to the fore in the examples of divine judgment in chapters 16-19. It seems less than fully clear that Wisdom is presenting "*imitatio Dei* as an unfolding of *imago Dei*", to quote the heading of chapter X.

Hint and implication of course belong to the manner of Wisdom. Overall, however, there remains a contrast between Wisdom, in its scattered allusions to image and its approaches to the vicinity, only, of *imitatio Dei*, and, on the other hand, the *Protrepticus* of Clement of Alexandria (4; 10–12), expressly exhorting to recovery of the image of God in humanity, in express connection with rejection of idols and imitation of God. The value of Helga Völkening's argument perhaps lies especially in its demonstration that the book of Wisdom, when viewed as a whole, seems to contrast idols with truer images of God, and to express the thought of being brought near to God through virtue together with the *imago*-theme, even though it may also evince reserve towards incorporating express mention of imitation into devotion to the God of Israel.

Helga Völkening well connects rabbinic as well as patristic homily with these aspects of Wisdom (the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers are not discussed in this connection). Her references to early twentieth-century Jewish study of *imitatio Dei* by Martin Buber and Arthur Marmorstein might have included Israel Abrahams, in his essay "The Imitation of God", and elsewhere; see Israel Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (First Series; Cambridge 1917) 166–217; (Second Series; Cambridge 1924) 138–182. Portraying *imitatio Dei* as an element in many religions, not least the ancient and mediaeval Judaism which he surveys, Abrahams stresses the hesitation which its anthropomorphism has often evoked. May such hesitation play a part in the seeming reserve with which Wisdom treats *imitatio Dei*?

These comments on the argument for thematic coherence do little justice to the range of material which Völkening considers, from reception-history onwards. A valuable survey of views of composition and structure takes seriously critical recognition of distinct parts of Wisdom, even though the author characterizes her own approach as synchronic or canonical. Correspondingly, an historical setting in the ancient Mediterranean diaspora is viewed throughout as important for interpretation. Treatment of the cultic rôles of images embraces Mesopotamia and Egypt as well as Greece and the Hellenistic kingdoms, and contemporary theory on image. A great deal is offered here, but interpretation of images and the important argument that the familiarity of image-veneration would have clarified what is implied in the text might have been further illuminated by notice of visual aspects of ancient piety, as treated, with some reference to Wisdom, by J.M.F. Heath, *Paul's Visual Piety* (Oxford 2013).

Helga Völkening gives an informative and rewarding treatment of a magnificent topic. Interpreters of Wisdom, and of ancient Jewish theology, will have to reckon with her argument.

Corpus Christi College
Cambridge CB2 1RH (England)

William HORBURY

Benjamin ZIEMER, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*. Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz (Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 182). Leiden, Brill, 2020. xviii-780 p. 16.5 × 25. €154,00

Benjamin Ziemer's book *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells* discusses the methodology of literary and redaction criticism with a focus on its assumption of constant

growth by additions. Ziemer compares variant editions in ancient Near Eastern (ANE) literature in order to perceive how texts developed and how scribes changed them. Although the book's focus is on the Hebrew Bible (HB), it also includes related literature (e.g., *Jubilees*, *Community Rule*, and *Genesis Apocryphon*) and texts in different languages and cultures (e.g., the Egyptian Book of the Dead, Gilgamesh Epic, the Synoptic Gospels, and Gospel harmonies). The empirical evidence in these texts would show that omissions, rewritings, and transpositions were common in the transmission of ANE literature. According to Ziemer, the evidence contradicts redaction-critical models, which build on the assumption of constant growth by additions only and which neglect or even reject omissions and rewriting as scribal techniques. He argues that there is no evidence for classic redactions, where textual layers encompassing entire books or compositions introduced new theological conceptions to old books. Instead, editors mainly used older texts as sources for new literary works, where the sources were only partially included (e.g., Chronicles vis-à-vis Kings). Contrary to what is assumed in literary criticism, new material would have been added to older texts only in exceptional cases. When this happened, as in the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), the additions were largely harmonizations between passages (710-711). Ziemer contends that the literary histories of biblical texts cannot be reconstructed with enough certainty to be scientifically sustainable and that the method's false axioms lead to distorted results (697-716). His conclusion thus questions the scientific foundation of literary and redaction criticism, and it especially undermines multilayered redaction-critical reconstructions (712-713). Instead of building on conventional redaction-critical theories, such as the Deuteronomistic History, biblical studies should focus on book selections found in later contexts, such as Qumran, and the differences of variant editions in the form in which they were preserved (e.g., MT, LXX, SP, Qumran manuscripts etc.). The task of redaction critics would be to study redactions for which there is text-critical evidence (382-383, 657-659, 715-716).

Ziemer is to be congratulated for taking on a crucial topic for the future of biblical studies. His book goes to the core of the methodology that uses biblical texts as historical sources beyond the preserved textual versions by reconstructing their earlier development. At stake is an established branch of biblical studies and its understanding of how biblical texts developed. Also to be applauded is Ziemer's ability to discuss different types of literature on a profound level and to be in critical dialogue with scholars in each respective field. The attempt to merge all this material into a synthesis on ancient scribal processes is already a respectable endeavor. Regardless of one's view of the conclusions, the book should not be bypassed in discussions of historical-critical methods in the future. It calls for a response from proponents of literary and redaction criticism, as it goes head-on against its methodological basis (see, e.g., R. Kratz, "Redaktionsgeschichte / Redaktionskritik I. Altes Testament", *TRE* 28 [1997] 367-378).

Part of Ziemer's criticism of literary and redaction criticism is justified. Omissions did take place, even in the transmission of the HB (see J. Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted* [Göttingen 2014] 183-252), and they have been neglected or even rejected by literary/redaction critics (e.g., U. Becker, *Exegese des Alten Testaments* [Tübingen 2005] 84). Documented examples from the SP and Jeremiah show that harmonizations between passages were very typical and perhaps the most common type of addition in the HB, but they are underrepresented in redaction-critical reconstructions (but not in all; see, e.g., C. Levin, *Die Verheißung des*

neuen Bundes [Göttingen 1984]). Reconstructed redactional layers typically revise entire compositions from a new theological perspective (e.g., T. Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose* [Göttingen 2004]), but they find little support in empirical evidence (Zierner, 365-374, 661-668, 697, 701-711). Loosely interconnected additions can be found in text-critical evidence, but they are much less systematic and more irregular than typically assumed redactions. For example, a number of additions in text-critical evidence emphasize the importance of the law, the commandments, or the covenant (e.g., Deut 26,17; Josh 1,7; 1 Kgs 11,33-34; 18,18; 19,10,14; cf. MT and LXX), but they are rather isolated and hardly correspond to a redactional layer. The MT Jeremiah contains a number of loosely connected additions (lacking in the LXX) that emphasize Babylon and Babylonians (their king, people, chronology, etc.; e.g., Jer 25,9.11.12), but it is difficult to see clear theological conceptions or coherence behind them. In general, additions documented in text-critical variants are mostly isolated and imply a rather fragmentary development by successive hands. In addition to harmonizations, many scribal interventions were additions that drew their information from the immediate context without adding substantially new information (e.g., 2 Kgs 23,29). They may clarify details (e.g., 1 Kgs 18,26), fill gaps (e.g., Gen 43,29), add titles, professions, patronyms, etc. (in MT Jeremiah *passim*; e.g., ch. 28), or seek to change the message by small subtle changes (see, e.g., K. De Troyer, "The History of the Biblical Text", *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* [eds. R. Müller – J. Pakkala] [Leuven 2017] 223-246). A substantial number of these additions are smaller (consisting of merely 1-3 words) than those commonly assumed by literary critics. Zierner is certainly right that many small additions would be challenging to detect without textual evidence (382, 659-661, 700).

Zierner's book contains a number of weaknesses. Not all evidence from the ANE is directly applicable to the HB. Its texts developed into a distinct kind of literature which was the object of intensive scribal activity due to its perceived status as authoritative and holy. The Pentateuch was assumed to contain a divine revelation (Exodus 19-23, Deuteronomy 5; 12-26), which could not be altered freely (e.g., Deut 4,2; 13,1), and gradually other books were similarly perceived. Empirical evidence shows a particular interest in preserving the exact wording, which resulted in congested, repetitive, and contradictory texts. This is especially apparent in theologically or otherwise central texts, which were repeatedly revised by successive hands (e.g., Deuteronomy 12; Joshua 1; 23-24; Judges 1-2; 1 Kings 8; 11; 2 Kings 17; 23). If later scribes had had a free hand to omit and rewrite, or even to make an entirely new version of the text, as Zierner assumes (697-700), one would expect much smoother texts.

It is evident that there were attempts to make entirely new versions of authoritative books, even of the divine revelation (e.g., *Temple Scroll*), but the scribes could not eradicate the old books from circulation (e.g., Chronicles vis-à-vis Kings). If a book was widely recognized and authoritative, its copies were circulating in many contexts, and therefore the creation of a new divine revelation, such as the *Temple Scroll*, would have little effect on the *Fortschreibung* of pentateuchal texts. An entirely new composition would have been regarded as a separate work. Moreover, the omission of parts of older authoritative or holy texts would have risked the new text not being widely acknowledged, as also happened with the *Temple Scroll*. Small and subtle changes rather than radical revisions seem to have been a more successful strategy to alter authoritative or holy texts.

Although we are looking at a period much before the formation of the canon, the perception of texts as authoritative and holy crucially influenced their transmission and scribal processes. This aspect is neglected in Ziemer's book. It is hazardous to equate scribal processes in other bodies of literature, each with special characteristics of their own, with those of the HB.

Another weakness is Ziemer's application of Greek translations as evidence for Hebrew scribal processes (cc. 10–13). It is likely that translations were perceived differently from the authoritative Hebrew versions, and translations were not intended to replace the translated texts. The genre of Esther as a story may partly explain why the Greek translations are so free (425–426), but the fact that they were translations may be a more important factor in understanding their differences from the MT. Moreover, translation techniques have to be distinguished from Hebrew scribal techniques, and therefore free translations, such as LXX Esther or the Alpha-text, are not ideal evidence for the present topic. Greek translations can be important witnesses for the Hebrew transmission *if* we can reach the Hebrew *Vorlage* with enough certainty; this is the case with faithful translations. Although Ziemer acknowledges the problem involved with free translations (704), it is surprising that his Greek evidence is nonetheless so heavily dependent on less faithful translations and otherwise controversial cases such as Esther, Daniel, and First Esdras (cc. 11–13) where it is challenging to reach the Hebrew *Vorlage* and to understand what actually took place in the Hebrew transmission.

Isaiah is potentially more fruitful (669–680). However, the three main witnesses — MT, LXX, and 1QIsa^a — are relatively close to each other, and variants are mostly small and not significant (693). On this basis, Ziemer assumes that there was only one version of the book during the Second Temple period, which for Ziemer is an argument against substantial redactional activity and gradual expansion during this time (691–694). Surprisingly, he concludes from the evidence in Isaiah that a similar picture should be expected in other books, such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Book of the Twelve Prophets (693). The conclusion appears to be contradicted by Ziemer's own analysis of Jeremiah (273–383), where two substantially different versions are preserved. Substantial text-critical variants in Ezekiel also bear witness to repeated additions. The MT Ezekiel, which is about 5% longer than the LXX version (see also Papyrus 967), is commonly assumed to contain repeated expansions (e.g., Ezekiel 6). Ziemer's conclusion that the books were not substantially expanded during Persian and Hellenistic times is problematic, since the preservation of textual traditions is largely coincidental, and only a fraction of the manuscript evidence is preserved. It is also likely that variant editions were harmonized towards a version regarded as more authoritative (the phenomenon is well known from the later textual history; cf. also the New Testament and LXX recensions), and this reduced variation in some textual traditions. In other words, the coincidental preservation of three relatively similar editions of Isaiah is a poor indication of the book's general transmission and scribal processes during Persian and Hellenistic times.

Of the LXX evidence Ziemer discusses, Jeremiah may be the most fruitful example since the LXX translation is commonly recognized as rather faithful to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, and the MT and the LXX clearly represent different stages or textual strands of the same book. Ziemer thus justly discusses Jeremiah very extensively (273–383). Despite a somewhat unconventional description of the textual history, Ziemer appears to agree that the MT was expanded and that

nothing was omitted. However, he interprets MT Jeremiah as an exception in the history of ancient literature, and as a possible reason for this he sees Jeremiah 36, which refers to the burning of the scroll (380-381). Ziemer's explanation is unconvincing, and Jeremiah is hardly an exception, even among Ziemer's own examples (SP), let alone in the rest of the text-critical evidence of the HB. The text-critical evidence from Jeremiah should have been supplemented with evidence in other faithful Greek translations such as Ezekiel, the Pentateuch and the historical books.

Text-critical evidence from Exodus (esp. cc. 35-40), Joshua, Samuel, Kings, and Ezekiel, in particular, is important, since variant editions are preserved and the Greek translations are faithful to the *Vorlage*. Textual variants in these books confirm the picture received from Jeremiah that additions are common (e.g., 1 Kgs 6,11-14; 8,5; 11,33.34.38-39; 15,5.23; 16,10.34 [cf. LXX^L]; 17,14; 21,15; 22,28), which implies gradual textual growth. Moreover, they also show that additions far outweigh all other types of scribal changes. In fact, it is difficult to find intentional omissions in the text-critical evidence from the Pentateuch or the historical books. Omissions seem to have taken place only when the older text contained something theologically offensive (Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted*, 183-252). That expansion was the general rule is also seen in the three variant versions of Gedaliah's murder (2 Kgs 25,25; Jer 41,1-3 [MT]; and Jer 48,1-3 [LXX]). The witnesses give three coincidentally preserved glimpses of a long and complicated literary history where the oldest version with 124 characters was inflated to 308 characters in the youngest version. Notably, nothing was omitted in the process (see J. Pakkala, "Gedaliah's Murder in 2 Kgs 25:25 and Jer 41:1-3", *Scripture in Transition* [eds. A. Voitiła – J. Jokiranta] [Leiden 2008] 401-411). Although Ziemer discusses empirical evidence in Jeremiah and the SP, the nearly complete lack of omissions, which Ziemer acknowledges (380-383, 657-659), would have contradicted evidence in other literature he discusses and would have led to the conclusion that the processes in the HB and especially its Hebrew transmission have their own characteristics. That authoritative and holy texts were not easily challenged by omissions and other radical interventions, such as entirely new versions, is understandable when we recognize their role in preserving the social order of the transmitting communities (see J. Pakkala, "Textual Development within Paradigms and Paradigm Shifts", *HeBAI* 3/3 [2014] 327-342).

By denying *Fortschreibung* or textual growth in the Hebrew Bible, Ziemer blurs the distinction between the creation of a literary work and *Fortschreibung* (13-15), and this allows him to use a variety of texts as evidence for the transmission of the HB. It is indisputable that scribes used sources selectively to write a new composition (e.g., the pentateuchal sources or the royal annals behind Kings are only partially preserved). The empirical evidence from the Chronicler's use of Kings may be applicable to the study of pentateuchal sources, but text-critical variants in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, or the historical books are much more relevant for the transmission of biblical texts. Another important question in the creation of new literary works involves whether it was written to replace the older text or meant to be read with it as a commentary or supplement, and as noted above, an attempt to replace an old, authoritative, and/or holy text would have easily failed. *Jubilees* and *Genesis Apocryphon* were probably meant as supplementary literature, and thus it was easier to accept them even if they omitted parts of their sources in Genesis. Their omissions cannot be equated with omissions in the transmission

of Kings, for instance. Acknowledging the difference, Ziemer rightly discusses the evidence in *Jubilees* and *Genesis Apocryphon* more briefly (461-482, 705), but this underscores that it is important to distinguish between the use of old sources in a new text and *Fortschreibung*, as well as to understand the relationship of a new text to its sources.

Ziemer's book illustrates how crucial it is to focus on relevant empirical evidence. Priority should be given to documented text-critical evidence that bears witness to scribal processes in the HB. Scribal processes in other literature (such as the Gilgamesh Epic or Gospel harmonies) may provide interesting comparative material that helps to understand processes in the HB, but caution is warranted in assuming that the processes are identical. Paradoxically, Ziemer characterizes Jeremiah, a central text for understanding the scribal processes of the HB, as an exception, while he assumes other ANE literature to be more relevant. Scribal processes are contingent on the perception of the text, its perceived function, relationship to the older text, the stage of transmission, and a variety of other factors (such as language and writing material), and therefore the HB itself is the best witness to its scribal processes.

Ziemer's conclusion that literary and redaction criticism should be abandoned has to be rejected. Many additions undeniably go undetected by literary critics and there may be occasional omissions that could hardly be restored, but the reconstructed exact wording as such should not be the goal of literary and redaction criticism. It is not necessary to detect every harmonization or small addition that adds a little new information. The more important task is to detect substantial changes in the texts and to understand the general development of conceptions and social realities behind the texts. Redaction-critical reconstructions should be seen as abstractions of a very complicated development and as theories constantly open to discussion, criticism and improvement. Despite the uncertainty of any theory — which involves all human sciences — literary and redaction criticism increase our understanding of ancient Israel and early Judaism by allowing us to reach earlier stages in biblical texts. For example, the method is essential when we try to understand YHWH's background as a storm God by using monarchic vestiges in the Psalms as sources (see R. Müller, *Jahwe als Wettergott* [Berlin 2008]).

Notwithstanding partial criticism and rejection of his general conclusion, Ziemer's book is a significant contribution to historical criticism. It pinpoints some of the problems of literary and redaction criticism, and it shows that their conventional forms are coming to an end. They need a new methodological basis that is better anchored in empirical evidence, especially that which bears witness to the Hebrew transmission and its scribal changes. The method's limits, but also its possibilities, should be more clearly acknowledged. Despite the obvious uncertainties involved, the method is still crucial for understanding ancient socio-political realities and the conceptions of ancient Israel and early Judaism.

Vuorikatu 3
P.O. Box 4
University of Helsinki
FIN-00014 Helsinki (Finland)
Juha.Pakkala@Helsinki.fi

Juha PAKKALA

Novum Testamentum

Arie W. ZWIEP, *Jairus's Daughter and the Haemorrhaging Woman. Tradition and Interpretation of an Early Christian Miracle Story* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 421). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2019. xxvi-454 p. 16.5 × 23.5. €139,00

Dans ce commentaire de Mc 5,21-43 / Mt 9,18-26 / Lc 8,40-56, Arie W. Zwiep étudie les récits évangéliques sous une variété d'angles méthodologiques, alors que généralement, les analyses utilisent une, deux voire trois approches au plus. Le but est d'analyser les textes des trois synoptiques avec la variété des instruments exégétiques et les stratégies interprétatives à disposition aujourd'hui, afin de scruter tous les effets de sens produits, comprendre la stratégie narrative et en tirer la signification théologique. Les sept chapitres se répartissent les approches diachroniques et synchroniques. L'auteur (AWZ) postule que ces différents examens et observations ne sont pas en concurrence mais se complètent pour une progression dans l'interprétation. Dans chaque chapitre, la dynamique est la suivante: la description de la méthode est suivie de brèves remarques explicatives avec, en notes, une large bibliographie sur le passage selon la méthode employée, puis une utilisation de la méthode est mise en œuvre avec des notes techniques pour expliquer les choix effectués.

Le chapitre 1 s'intéresse à l'histoire de la rédaction et à celle de l'interprétation des trois textes synoptiques. Il commence par les tentatives d'harmonisation des récits synoptiques aux premiers siècles et les interprétations allégoriques médiévales, puis passe en revue les théories historico-critiques, même les plus récentes, y compris la théorie de la mort apparente (coma) et l'interprétation mythique. Puis il aborde l'histoire des formes, la question des sources, les approches littéraires et narratives, sans oublier l'interprétation sociocritique féministe, la critique psychanalytique et les lectures contextuelles post-structurales.

On pourra finalement retenir que la recherche historique et en particulier le questionnement sur les faits et leur véracité historique traversent les siècles. Ce chapitre a l'intérêt de faire un état de la question de la recherche des premiers siècles jusqu'au nôtre pour développer les dernières approches littéraires, narratives, féministes et contextuelles. Les dernières remarques pointent sur la christologie de ce passage chez les trois synoptiques où sont développés les pouvoirs de Jésus sur la maladie et la mort et non sur l'impureté ou sur les caractères des femmes.

Le chapitre 2 rend compte de la variété des diverses traductions possibles. La critique textuelle étant étudiée en annexe, l'auteur, procède à une étude linguistique approfondie afin de proposer une interprétation qui s'appuie sur le travail de nombreux spécialistes de différentes nationalités.

Le chapitre 3 s'intéresse à l'agencement des trois récits, AWZ rappelant que l'agencement du texte et le développement des péripéties du récit chez Marc et Luc ne sont pas identiques chez Matthieu. La péricope de chaque évangéliste ayant une place différente dans le macro-récit a donc une fonction narrative différente; ainsi la péricope lucanienne doit être replacée dans l'ensemble Luc-Actes

pour voir son rôle — à la page 113 un intéressant tableau compare des séquences de chaque péricope.

Le chapitre 4 étudie la tradition et la rédaction de chaque péricope pour essayer de voir qui de celle de Matthieu, Marc ou Luc est la première à avoir été rédigée et quel récit a influencé les deux autres. Ce chapitre étudiant la formation des différentes couches de transmission orales ou écrites et les sources des rédacteurs, propose un tableau sur les temps employés (Marc au présent / Matthieu et Luc au passé, 147). L'hypothèse de l'antériorité de Marc est considérée comme la plus probable.

Pour AWZ, chez Marc, les deux récits (hémorroïsse et fille de Jaïre) (5.21-24 + 35-43 et 5.25-34) ne proviennent probablement pas de la même source, la question est de savoir si elles ont été agencées par Marc qui a l'habitude de construire des «sandwiches» (148) ou si un agencement antérieur existait, car AWZ n'exclut pas la possibilité d'une version écrite ou orale antérieure. Puis l'étude se concentre sur les reprises de Marc par Mt 9,18-26 et Lc 8,40-56.

Matthieu a repris Marc mais à sa façon car chez lui «less is more», afin de se focaliser sur Jésus et construire une réflexion christologique. Matthieu élimine certaines particularités concernant les personnages ou l'action comme le nom du notable (ἄρχων), l'âge de la jeune fille, la foule qui accompagne Jésus pour arriver jusqu'à la jeune fille, les détails de la maladie de la femme hémorroïsse, l'injonction au silence final, quelques péripéties pour se focaliser sur Jésus comme personnage principal ayant un pouvoir sur la mort et ce dès le début du récit, car le notable lui dit que sa fille est morte et qu'il doit venir la sauver de la mort. Matthieu utilise un vocabulaire théologique issu de la Septante (157 – 5 caractéristiques) et AWZ cite Is 49,7-8 repris par Matthieu dans la version de la Septante. Le récit de Lc 8,40-56 reprend aussi celui de Marc et le suit plus fidèlement que Matthieu, même si quelques changements du texte de Marc sont significatifs comme les nombreux problèmes subis par l'hémorroïsse du fait de sa maladie (cf. Mc 5,26) non relatés chez Luc (8,43); de même pour la place centrale et originale de Pierre chez Luc.

Une des difficultés du commentaire en ce ch. 4 concerne les sources de Mt 9,18-26 et Lc 8,40-56: d'après AWZ, Matthieu et Luc n'auraient pas utilisé d'autres sources que Marc et Q. Le problème vient de la question des accords mineurs entre Matthieu et Luc qui est peu discutée par AWZ.

Dans le chapitre 5, AWZ s'intéresse à la question d'une version orale qui serait à la source de l'épisode Mc 5,21-43, en particulier à la source des deux histoires originellement différentes, une concernant la fille de Jaïre et une autre l'hémorroïsse. AWZ cherche des critères clairs et sûrs et note onze marqueurs d'oralité qu'il applique ensuite à Mc 5,21-47 (207-220). Il conclut ce chapitre en disant que si des récits oraux (une version araméenne traduite ensuite en grec) ont très probablement existé, on ne peut retrouver avec certitude leurs sources.

Sans nier cet intéressant travail sur l'oralité, les interrogations ne manquent pas. En effet l'utilisation du présent historique et l'emploi fréquent d'un style parataxique seraient selon AWZ des marqueurs d'oralité (211), alors qu'il dit lui-même dans son chapitre quatre que l'utilisation du présent historique et l'emploi fréquent de la parataxe appartiennent au style de la rédaction de Marc (146-147). De même la variation et la répétition d'un geste comme celui de toucher (ἅπτω) Jésus, le vêtement, les franges du vêtement (Mc 5,27.28.30) peuvent-ils être considérés à la fois comme marqueur d'oralité (212) et caractéristiques du style écrit de Marc (151)?

Au début du chapitre 6, AWZ énumère les instruments et les catégories de l'analyse narrative (225-231). Il s'intéresse à la communication narrative, à l'intrigue, à l'agencement des scènes puis aux personnages, à leur caractérisation et au point de vue pour chaque péricope. En outre il étudie l'intertextualité et note leur importance pour la christologie de chaque péricope.

Développant Kingsbury, il déclare que si Matthieu ne reprend pas toutes les complications et les détails concernant les personnages de la version Marc, l'intrigue de Matthieu reste opérante quant à la situation finale de la petite fille et à la puissance de Jésus, en particulier sur la mort. Néanmoins AWZ semble moins à l'aise avec l'approche narrative qu'avec les méthodes diachroniques. Il ne se demande pas pourquoi, chez Marc, Jésus force la femme guérie à dire sa foi devant tous, pourquoi la narration développe les obstacles qui s'accumulent et empêchent Jésus d'avancer vers la fille de Jaïre, car ces obstacles mettent en valeur la détermination de Jésus; de même la fonction narrative du parallélisme des deux récits agencés «en sandwich» est peu présentée. Chez Luc, dont certaines particularités sont reprises à Marc, AWZ ne parle pas de la problématique lucanienne de l'*anagnôrisis* (la reconnaissance de Jésus, en particulier de son identité de prophète) qui est développée dans la péricope et déjà auparavant dans les trois récits de miracle précédents où Jésus sauve des personnages qui sont sur le point de mourir ou sont déjà morts — et sont parallèles à ceux de Lc 7,1-10.

Au chapitre 7, AWZ rassemble les différentes lignes de sa recherche. Pour Mc 5,21-43, outre les deux récits dont les origines sont diverses, si leur agencement pointe sur la foi et la puissance de Jésus sur les éléments, la maladie, la mort, l'épisode conduit au rejet de Jésus dans sa patrie en Mc 6,1-6, préparant pastoralement son auditoire aux tribulations qu'il va subir. Chez Mt 9,18-26 la réduction des motifs Marc pointe vers une christologisation du récit en rapport avec Is 49,7. L'épisode Lc 8,40-56, très proche de sa source en Marc, a une fonction narrative dans le diptyque Luc-Actes. Luc a voulu équilibrer les deux récits avec un homme (Jaïre) et une femme, et donner une position spéciale à Pierre, anticipant son rôle dans Actes. La version de Luc semble inspirée du cycle Élie-Élisée.

L'ouvrage se termine par trois annexes très documentées (311-346): d'abord une discussion de la critique textuelle des trois versions, puis un aperçu de toutes les références intertextuelles dans les différentes éditions de Nestlé-Aland afin de les évaluer; enfin de nombreuses références patristiques et apocryphes. Viennent ensuite deux bibliographies (347-410): une sur l'épisode (de 1900 à aujourd'hui) avec plus de 200 références de livres et d'articles et une plus générale. Le livre se termine par trois index (411-454) concernant les textes bibliques et deutérocanoniques, les auteurs et les sujets traités.

L'étude a le grand mérite d'examiner le texte par divers côtés en utilisant plusieurs approches et de rendre compte des divers travaux existants. Le travail, très bien documenté, pointe vers l'oralité des textes et son impact sur leur rédaction. Ce commentaire se lit bien et pourra aider efficacement les lecteurs désireux de comprendre les différentes approches et leur application à une péricope.

David C. BIENERT, *Das Abendmahl im johanneischen Kreis. Eine exegetisch-hermeneutische Studie zur Mahltheologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 202). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2020. xvii-616 p. 16 × 23.5. €119,95

Publication d'une thèse soutenue à la faculté de théologie évangélique de Münster en 2010-2011, ce copieux ouvrage se signale par l'ampleur de son projet. L'abondante bibliographie qui constitue le sixième chapitre remplit les pages 531-594, suivi d'un index des citations bibliques et extra-canoniques, conclu par celui des écrits rabbiniques et des auteurs de l'Antiquité (595-616). L'information est bien assurée sur les différents repas dans l'évangile johannique. Jean 6 est pris en compte, mais aussi le repas avec Lazare, Marie et Marthe (Jn 12,1-9) et le repas au bord du lac de Tibériade (Jn 21,1-24). L'objet formel de l'enquête rejoint tout l'évangile et la problématique exégétique à son endroit. Malgré le sous-titre qui met en valeur la portée herméneutique de l'investigation, l'enquête apparaît surtout heuristique, compte tenu du relevé des différentes approches rappelées et proposées.

Ainsi le premier chapitre au cours des cent premières pages fait-il droit à la recherche sur le «dîner» dans le cercle johannique. Il s'ouvre sur une clarification des termes: *Abendmahl, Herrenmahl oder Eucharistie*. Elle s'explique entre autres sur leur arrière-fond juif, «hellénistique-romain» et plus largement confessionnel. La discussion s'annonce serrée et si complexe qu'elle défie les limites d'une recension. L'auteur dispose de toutes les pièces du dossier sur l'histoire des religions et l'histoire sociale jusqu'au questionnement contemporain sur le repas chrétien primitif. Le rapport au «sacrement» ne pouvait être éludé et se trouve traité de manière nuancée mais orientée. La question du «cercle johannique» est honorée dans le respect des différentes manières de l'envisager. *Johannes und das Abendmahl in der Geschichte des Christentums* fournit l'horizon antique et moderne de la recherche en la matière, bien condensé dans les deux types de classification de H. Klos et de R. Kysar (58-59). L'état de la recherche depuis 1985 se conclut par un résumé très bienvenu (87-88). Les droits de la synchronie et de la diachronie sont reconnus et bien exploités, de même que la nécessaire prise en compte de l'évangile dans son ensemble pour y voir clair sur la place qu'y prend la question du dernier repas.

La voie est ainsi tracée vers le chapitre II. Il s'attache à la composition et à la rédaction du quatrième évangile (101-278). Une imposante quantité de propositions sont examinées au point que l'on s'y perd un peu au détriment d'une évaluation critique progressive qui puisse dégager l'essentiel de l'accessoire. Du point de vue de la composition du texte, la question de la *Gattung* survient en tête pour conduire à une valorisation de la créativité littéraire à l'œuvre dans les textes. C'est ce qui conduit à un déploiement narratif de la théologie christologique de l'évangile grâce à l'étude des repas successifs qui s'y déploient, sans oublier la prise en compte du grain de blé tombé en terre (Jn 12,24) et le développement sur la vigne (Jn 15,1-11: découpage bien assuré).

En matière de structure, tout en regrettant une justification plus serrée, on ne peut qu'accorder son assentiment au découpage «classique» jusqu'à un certain point parce qu'il faudrait y apporter des précisions: I. Prologue et préhistoire (Jn 1,1-18; 1,19-51); II. L'œuvre du Révélateur pour le monde (Jn 2,1 – 12,50); III. La révélation de Jésus aux siens (Jn 13,1 – 17,26); IV. Passion et résurrection

de Jésus (Jn 18,1 – 20,29); V. Fin et épilogue (Jn 20,30s; 21,1-25). «Révéléteur» et «révélation» portent l'empreinte bultmanienne de la proposition. D'autres structurations, de G. Østendad et H. Thyen notamment, sont rappelées. Mais l'on s'attendrait ici comme ailleurs à une évaluation critique qui dicte une préférence. Il faut en dire autant des macro-structures chiastiques de l'évangile: la suite des récits de miracles comme mettant en valeur une double inclusion entre la noce à Cana (Jn 2,1-12) et la pêche miraculeuse (Jn 21,1-14), d'une part, et les deux guérisons du paralytique le sabbat (Jn 5,1-18) et celle de l'aveugle-né, également le sabbat (Jn 9,1-41: découpage à justifier; la suite de Jean 10 est indissociable de Jean 9), d'autre part. Il y a là, certes, des indices de structure, mais à confronter avec plusieurs autres pour favoriser un consensus fondé. On en dira autant des autres structures sur la base des expressions en: «Moi, je suis», du cycle des fêtes — en particulier les trois fêtes de Pâques, propres à Jean —, des fêtes de pèlerinage en Israël, de l'importance du sabbat en Jean 5 et 9 et de la fête des Tentés (7,2 – 10,21). Des excursus sur «l'agneau de Dieu» (140-146) et «le salut est des Juifs» (172-174) mettent bien en valeur des versets décisifs, mais ils surgissent au fil des textes considérés par la multiplication de principes de structuration qui détournent l'attention de l'objet principal de l'étape en cours. «La pragmatique de l'évangile johannique» expose aux mêmes interrogations, tout en aidant à entrer dans le vif des textes. La démarche conduit enfin à des considérations d'ensemble en vue de l'interprétation (264-278). L'enchaînement logique est difficile à saisir entre ces étapes du travail. L'auteur semble adhérer à l'hypothèse qui a fait date de J. L. Martyn au sujet du drame à deux niveaux que représente le quatrième évangile, sans que cet accord auquel il y a de bonnes raisons de souscrire découle des analyses précédentes, comme le montre d'ailleurs l'orientation évoquée. L'urgence d'une hiérarchisation des critères en matière de composition — plus statique — et de structure — plus dynamique — de l'évangile s'impose pour pouvoir dès lors déboucher plus naturellement sur l'interprétation. Le chapitre III (279-508), consacré à des exégèses isolées, est donc le bienvenu pour retrouver la littéralité des textes.

Les remarques préliminaires (279-280) ne conjurent pas le risque de verser dans une théologie de la substitution en ce qui concerne le rapport entre la Tora juive et le livre de l'évangile (20,30). Ceci dit, l'étude de «l'acte majeur: le miracle du vin à Cana (Jn 2,1-12)» (281-326) est exemplaire pour faire de la noce à Cana un texte-clé de la théologie du repas en Jean. Le rapport à Exode 19 à propos du «troisième jour» aurait pu valoriser davantage le repas d'alliance, mais l'incidence du festin messianique, notamment chez Isaïe, est bien notée. Les allusions possibles au repas de la Sagesse auraient sans doute aussi gagné à être relevées. À cet égard, le lien de contraste avec les antiques légendes de Dionysos (320-324) montre la distance entre de telles références et l'évangile. L'article de A. Vanhoye, «Interrogation johannique et exégèse de Cana», *Bib* 55 (1974) 157-167, inconnu de l'auteur, aurait pu problématiser la question de «l'heure» dans les propos de Jésus. Impossible de contester la pertinence du «centre — alimentation-multiplication des pains, marche sur les eaux et discours sur le pain (Jn 6,1-59)» (326-401); «la réaction du groupe des disciples (Jn 6,60-71)» est assurée en 401-404. La comparaison avec la *Didachè* est innovante et stimulante (404-412). Le lecteur reste cependant sur sa faim en ce qui concerne la question cruciale: pourquoi l'auteur johannique place-t-il en Jn 6,52-59 ce qu'il veut dire sur le rapport à l'institution de l'eucharistie chez Jean lors de la deuxième Pâque de Jésus, en pleine vie publique, au lieu de la dernière Cène lors de la troisième et dernière Pâque en Jean 13? En fait, Jésus n'attend pas la fin de sa vie pour se donner chair et sang dans

l'agapē en réponse à la condamnation à mort pour le double motif — injuste — de violation de la loi et de blasphème (Jn 5,19). Il répond en ce sens à l'injustice par le don suprême de soi dès le point culminant de la vie publique (cf. Y. Simoens, *Évangile selon Jean* [Paris 2018] 165-168.171). Il est par contre très pertinent d'accorder toute son importance au «repas avec les amis (Jn 12,1-8) comme prélude au "dernier repas"» (424-425). «Le repas d'adieu de Jésus avec ses disciples (Jn 13,1 – 17,26)» peut dès lors prendre tout son essor en recélant sans doute une des contributions les plus précieuses de l'ouvrage (426-478): l'insistance, parfaitement fondée, sur «l'heure du repas comme heure de la glorification» (476-477). La tendance lourde de l'exégèse ancienne et moderne postpose plutôt la glorification à la croix, la mort et/ou la résurrection. Or la gloire ne coïncide pas avec les événements postérieurs: elle les précède. Il aurait encore fallu mieux dissocier, comme le fait l'auteur de l'évangile, Judas du «Fils de la Perdition» (Jn 17,12) pour ne pas faire du disciple qui trahit son Maître le premier damné de l'histoire, en exposant ainsi du même coup l'accomplissement de l'Écriture à fonctionner comme argument favorable à la prédestination au mal et à l'enfer (voir Y. Simoens, «La prière glorifiante de Jésus en Jn 17», *EstBib* 78 [2020] 219-233, surtout 227-230). *Die Erhöhung am Kreuz* (Jn 19,23-27)» (478-488) fait droit à l'*Unversehrtheit*: le fait que Jésus soit indemne de toute complicité à l'égard du mal et du péché, en correspondance avec le «grand jour» de la Pâque juive (Jn 19,30) et l'accomplissement de l'Écriture (Jn 19,28 ; cf. 19,36-37). Mais il faut être reconnaissant à l'auteur de ne pas avoir entretenu de césure — très fréquente — entre les chapitres 18-19 et 20-21, au nom d'une inclusion entre le jardin de 18,1 et celui de 19,41, alors que ces deux jardins sont bien différents. *Das Mahl in Joh 21 als Reflex auf die Gemeindepraxis* (488-508) établit dès lors le parallélisme avec Jean 6 puis avec Jean 13. À ce titre, il n'y a pas lieu, selon nous, de lire en Jean 21 un «épilogue»: il s'agit d'une pièce maîtresse de l'édifice textuel complet qui ne saurait faire le pendant au prologue hymnique de Jn 1,1-18.

Le chapitre IV: *Ergebnisse und Ausblick*, synthétise les acquis de l'ouvrage: 1. *Das johanneische Mahl als Kultersatz* (Ersatz: est-ce le plus adéquat à ce sujet?); 2. *Das Mahl als wahrhaftiges Zeichen*, où se fait encore sentir un relent de «substitution»; 3. *Die johanneische Mahltheologie im Kontext*; 4. *Mahltheologie oder Worttheologie? Ein Epilog*. Les différences confessionnelles demeurent transparentes. Une postface datée de 2016 fait état de publications parues depuis la soutenance de la thèse pour en approfondir quelques considérations. L'étude se recommande comme une somme imposante sur un axe majeur de la littérature johannique.

42, rue de Grenelle
F-75007 Paris
yves.simoens@jesuites.com

Yves SIMOENS

Jeffrey M. TRIPP, *Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 493). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2019. xii-323 p. 15.5 × 23.5. €89,00

Il volume presenta la versione riveduta della tesi di dottorato di J. M. Tripp scritta sotto la direzione di E. Lupieri e difesa presso il Dipartimento di Teologia della Loyola University di Chicago nel 2016.

Tripp si pone l'obiettivo di studiare il fenomeno giovanneo delle "citazioni dirette interne", indicando con tale etichetta le ripetizioni, generalmente associate a variazioni, di precedenti dichiarazioni del medesimo o diverso locutore, rintracciabili nei confini della storia narrata; ne propone un elenco nell'Appendice che chiude il volume (260-269).

Nel c. 1 (1-23) presenta una breve ricognizione dello stato della ricerca, in cui lamenta come gli studi precedenti si siano limitati a ridurre tali citazioni a mero fenomeno stilistico. Come eccezioni e suoi punti di riferimento cita M. Theobald (*Herrenworte im Johannesevangelium* [HBS 34; Freiburg 2002]) e J. Brankaer («Les citations internes dans le quatrième évangile: un miroir déformant?», *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel*. Style, Text, Interpretation [eds. G. van Belle – M. Labahn – P. Maritz] [BETL 223; Leuven – Paris – Walpole 2009] 129-155), che di tali citazioni hanno inteso esplorare il significato. Tripp dichiara, dunque, di voler effettuare uno studio comparativo, che metta a confronto il fenomeno delle citazioni giovannee con quello analogo presente nella letteratura biblico-veterotestamentaria e greco-ellenistica, al fine di stabilirne la funzione nel contesto narrativo e di esplorare cosa abbia da rivelare in merito al contesto letterario e teologico dell'autore del Quarto Vangelo (d'ora in poi QV) e al rapporto che egli instaura con le tradizioni pre-evangeliche. Il volume appare così articolato in due parti, una più strettamente letteraria (cc. 2 e 3), dedicata all'analisi della funzione narrativa delle citazioni dirette interne del QV a confronto con la letteratura veterotestamentaria e greco-ellenistica, e una più di carattere storico-critico (cc. 4 e 5), dedicata al rapporto che il QV instaura, tramite l'uso delle citazioni, con le altre tradizioni cristiane.

Più in dettaglio, il c. 2 (25-74) esamina le citazioni giovannee al fine di individuarne la funzione nel contesto narrativo prossimo. Ipotizzando che l'autore del QV abbia potuto ricevere una formazione retorica greco-ellenistica di scuola, che comprendesse la tecnica della parafrasi, Tripp organizza le citazioni secondo le categorie indicate nel I secolo d.C. da Elio Teone nei *Progymnasmata* (parafrasi per trasposizione, addizione, sottrazione, sostituzione) e le analizza a confronto con esempi tratti dall'AT (mutuati dallo studio di G. W. Savran, *Telling and Retelling*. Quotations in Biblical Narrative [Bloomington, IN 1988]) e dagli scritti di Platone (*Protagora*), Demostene (*Contro Midia*) e Seneca (*Suasoriae*). Dalla ricognizione evince che nel QV le modifiche — anche quando minime — di precedenti dichiarazioni non sono casuali, ma dovute ad un utilizzo consapevole della parafrasi, coerente con l'uso antico e volto ad operare una reinterpretazione della precedente dichiarazione in base agli interessi o al fraintendimento del nuovo locutore.

Il c. 3 (75-119) passa a considerare la funzione delle citazioni nel contesto del macro-racconto. La prima parte del capitolo (75-83) si avvale degli studi di linguistica sulla ridondanza di S. Suleiman («Redundancy and the "Readable" Text», *Poetics Today* 1/3 [1980] 119-142) per mostrare come l'uso ripetuto delle citazioni diventi nel QV una tecnica di caratterizzazione dei personaggi. L'esempio a sostegno dell'ipotesi riguarda la questione introdotta da Gesù della brevità del tempo in cui egli sarà ancora presente. Mentre la ripetizione delle medesime dichiarazioni da parte di Gesù (Gv 7,33-34; 8,21; 16,16) è lo strumento per affermare l'unica interpretazione autentica della sua missione e identità, le reiterate citazioni delle sue dichiarazioni da parte degli interlocutori (Gv 7,35-36; 8,22; 16,17-18) sono il segnale del loro persistente fraintendimento. La seconda parte del capitolo (83-119) propone l'ipotesi di Tripp sulla ragione della presenza di tali citazioni

lungo lo sviluppo del macro-racconto. Esse sarebbero uno degli strumenti letterari con cui viene sviluppato il motivo processuale che attraversa il QV e contribuirebbero a farne il documento forense che raccoglie la testimonianza del discepolo amato. Per sviluppare il proprio argomento Tripp torna all'analisi comparativa, passando in rassegna alcuni passi dell'*Apologia* di Platone, del romanzo *Leucippe e Clitofonte* di Achille Tazio, dell'AT (2 Re 2,37-42) e del NT (Ap 3,17; 18,7; Mc 3,22-30; 12,35; 14,55-59; Lc 24,6-7; Mt 26,59-61; 27,63; At 6,12-14; 24,18-21), che, come i passi del QV da lui studiati (111-119), presentano citazioni dirette in scene dall'ambientazione giudiziale e/o testimoniale.

Col c. 4 (122-181) la ricerca si sposta sul terreno della critica della tradizione. Prendendo atto del fatto che il QV condivide con i Sinottici un elevato numero di citazioni interne dirette pronunciate da Gesù o a lui relative, Tripp ne effettua un'analisi comparata. A tal scopo si avvale degli studi di noti autori, come P. Gardner-Smith, M. Theobald, U.C. von Wahlde, F. Neirynck, che si sono occupati dei rapporti fra il QV e i Sinottici o delle ipotetiche redazioni giovanee, chi a livello di critica della redazione chi di critica delle fonti o della tradizione. L'obiettivo è quello di mostrare come la tecnica della parafrasi consenta all'autore del QV di incorporare e interpretare materiale tradizionale secondo la propria cristologia e i propri interessi. Da questa analisi Tripp deduce un'ulteriore funzione delle citazioni giovanee: indicare la posizione che il QV assume rispetto alla tradizione pre-evangelica e alle altre tradizioni cristiane.

Il c. 5 (183-234) chiude l'analisi identificando altre tre funzioni delle citazioni in rapporto alla posizione assunta dal QV rispetto alla tradizione cristiana, in questo caso relativamente all'escatologia. Tripp esamina le dichiarazioni di Gesù sui propri movimenti di venuta nel mondo/ritorno al Padre con riferimento ad alcuni testi dell'apocalittica giudaica (Ag 2,4-7; 1 Enoch, Hazon Gabriel, 2 Baruc). L'intenzione è quella di mostrare come le citazioni ripetute e mutate a seconda del contesto narrativo (ostile in Giovanni 7-8; discepolare nel discorso della cena) consentano al QV due operazioni teologiche: affermare la propria comprensione escatologica, che coniuga escatologia realizzata (la risurrezione di Gesù e la sua venuta nella Chiesa tramite lo Spirito) ed escatologia futura (la parusia); fondare nelle parole stesse di Gesù la propria radicale reinterpretazione del modo in cui il credente può accedere a Dio nel tempo presente, tramite cioè un'esperienza di visione e ascolto vissuta durante la celebrazione del culto, definita da Tripp "profetismo giovanista" nel solco di A. Destro – M. Pesce (*Come nasce una religione. Antropologia ed esegesi del Vangelo di Giovanni* [Percorsi 8; Roma 2000]).

Il c. 6 (235-248) sintetizza i risultati dello studio, indicando ulteriori piste di ricerca.

Il lavoro di Tripp appare decisamente apprezzabile per lo sforzo di collocare un fenomeno caratteristico del QV nel contesto della letteratura antica, cosicché risulta messo in chiaro come l'autore del QV usi in modo consapevole uno strumento linguistico condiviso con la letteratura del suo tempo e, dunque, come lo studio comparativo sia utile a una migliore comprensione del racconto giovanneo. Sono tuttavia da registrare alcuni limiti, soprattutto di ordine metodologico, che rendono l'argomentazione debole e poco convincente in alcuni risultati. Se ne menziona uno relativo alla prima parte.

Tripp dichiara di voler studiare la funzione delle citazioni per superare la riduzione del fenomeno a mera caratteristica stilistica, come effettuato dai contributi precedenti. Dimentica però la pubblicazione *Repetitions and Variations in the*

Fourth Gospel. Style, Text, Interpretation (eds. G. van Belle – M. Labahn – P. Maritz) (BETL 223; Leuven – Paris – Walpole 2009) — da cui per altro attinge il contributo della Brankaer, come esempio virtuoso a cui rifarsi —, che raccoglie i contributi presentati all'omonimo *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* del 2006. Il *Colloquium* aveva inteso fare il punto degli studi sulle ripetizioni e variazioni del QV, di cui il fenomeno studiato da Tripp fa parte, e indicare alcune prospettive di ricerca che potessero orientare gli studi successivi. In particolare, il contributo iniziale a firma di G. van Belle («Theory of Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel. A Neglected Field of Research?», 13-29) aveva inteso ridefinire il concetto di stile, così da chiarire lo stretto rapporto fra stile e funzione comunicativa di un testo: lo stile è costituito dalla selezione e ripetizione di elementi linguistici di un repertorio più ampio e la scelta di ogni elemento è determinata dalla funzione comunicativa del testo. Van Belle ne deduceva la necessità di studiare i singoli elementi linguistici del QV tenendo conto sia del suo stile complessivo sia della sua funzione comunicativa. Questa impostazione consente di superare una comprensione riduttiva dell'analisi stilistica del QV e stabilisce che non è possibile studiare nessun fenomeno linguistico, citazioni dirette comprese, al di fuori del suo contesto narrativo. È proprio qui che la prima parte dello studio di Tripp mostra il suo limite più consistente. Pur dichiarando di voler identificare la funzione delle citazioni nel loro contesto narrativo prossimo e ampio, nella sua analisi non prende in considerazione gli elementi che contribuiscono a formare tale contesto. Non vengono studiati né la natura narrativa o retorica né lo sviluppo né tanto meno i modelli compositivi dei passi in cui le citazioni si trovano, e neppure vengono affrontati i problemi di natura esegetica che sollevano sia i passi che le citazioni. Uno studio di questo tipo avrebbe certamente obbligato a ridurre l'esame ad un numero limitato di citazioni, arrivando a risultati parziali relativi alle sezioni studiate, ma avrebbe evitato di cadere in un'analisi che risulta semplificatrice e formale, dal momento che si limita ad un lavoro di comparazione fra le varie citazioni — proprio ciò che Tripp sembrerebbe voler scongiurare, quando lamenta la riduzione delle citazioni a mero fenomeno stilistico. Rimane la bontà di una ricerca che ha inteso mostrare l'utilità di studiare il QV e il suo stile nel contesto ampio della letteratura biblica e coeva.

Via degli Artisti, 38
00187, Roma

Alessandra CASNEDA

ALBERT VANHOYE, S.J. (1923-2021)

In memoriam

Albert Vanhoye est né le 24 juillet 1923 à Hazebrouck dans le Nord de la France et est décédé le 29 juillet 2021 à Rome. Il entra dans la Compagnie de Jésus en 1941. Après une licence de lettres classiques, des études de philosophie scolastique et de théologie, il fut ordonné prêtre le 25 juillet 1954. Envoyé à Rome pour une licence en Écritures Saintes il y défendit également une thèse de doctorat intitulée *La Structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux* (Tournai 1963), qui fut rapidement connue des exégètes du monde entier.

A. Vanhoye enseigna d'abord au scolasticat jésuite de Chantilly, et il fut ensuite nommé à l'Institut Biblique Pontifical de Rome où il résida de 1963 à 2008. Il fut doyen de la faculté biblique (1969-1975), directeur de la revue *Biblica* (1978-1984) et de la collection de monographies bibliques *Analecta Biblica* (1990-2006), également recteur du même institut (1984-1990). Il dirigea 29 thèses de doctorat et enseigna sur différents écrits du Nouveau Testament: les lettres aux Hébreux, aux Galates et aux Éphésiens, ainsi que sur les charismes. En 1984, il fut nommé président du *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense*, qui alterne AT et NT, et, en 1995, il fut président du *Colloquio Ecumenico Paolino*, qui se réunit tous les deux ans en l'abbaye Saint-Paul-Hors-les-Murs, à Rome, et fut aussi président de l'association internationale des spécialistes du Nouveau Testament, la *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* (SNTS), qui se réunit cette année-là à Prague.

Membre de la commission biblique pontificale (1984-2001), il en fut le secrétaire de 1990 à 2001, période durant laquelle la commission publia deux documents qui eurent un écho mondial, *L'interprétation de la Bible dans l'Église* (Libreria Editrice Vaticana 1993) et *Le peuple juif et ses saintes Écritures dans la Bible chrétienne* (Libreria Editrice Vaticana 2001).

Outre les services publics qu'il rendit, il fut très souvent consulté par la Congrégation pour la doctrine de la Foi. Le cardinal Ratzinger eut totale confiance en son jugement et en ses compétences et le remercia, une fois devenu Benoît XVI, en le créant cardinal et en le déclarant «grande esegeta» lors de la cérémonie (mars 2006).

En plus de sa thèse doctorale sur la composition d'Hébreux, on retiendra les essais suivants qui reflètent bien son exégèse très analytique et pourtant très lisible: *Situation du Christ. Épître aux hébreux 1 et 2* (Paris 1969); *Prêtres anciens, prêtre nouveau selon le Nouveau Testament* (Paris 1980); *La Lettre aux Hébreux. Jésus-Christ, médiateur d'une nouvelle alliance* (Paris 2002); *L'épître aux Hébreux*. Un prêtre différent (Pendé 2010); *I carismi nel Nuovo Testamento* (Roma 2011).

A. Vanhoye fut aussi un collaborateur fidèle de *Biblica*. Outre une quinzaine de recensions méticuleuses de livres d'exégèse, de 1962 à 2002 il publia dix-neuf articles dans notre revue: si neuf d'entre eux montrent l'intérêt constant qu'il eut pour la lettre aux Hébreux, il en écrivit aussi sur les lettres attribuées à Paul et sur les autres écrits du NT, des récits synoptiques à l'Apocalypse, signe qu'il suivait attentivement l'évolution notable subie par l'exégèse durant la deuxième moitié du XX^e siècle.

PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM BIBLICUM
ANNUS ACADEMICUS 2020-2021. II SEMESTRE

Auditores inscripti erant 309, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	66	212	18	296
Fac. Orientalistica	0	1	12	13
Universi	66	213	30	309
Nationes	72	Alumni	309	
Dioceses	134	Alumni	148	
Inst. Religiosorum	44	Alumni	96	
Inst. Religiosarum	17	Alumnae	20	
Ex statu laicali	45	Alumnae	30	
		Alumni	15	

LAUREAE

Laurea in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

EDE Stan-William Oshiozekhai, “’Ĕlōhîm ’Ăḥērîm” versus “’Ĕlōhê Yiśrā’ēl”. Dynamics of Persuasion in 1 Kings 11:26–14:20 — Moderatore: Prof. Peter Dubovský, S.J.

GALAZZO Maurizio, *La voce di Paolo nel «tempo della dipartita» (2Tm 4,6)*. Riscritture testamentarie nel corpus pastorale — Moderatore: Prof. Pasquale Basta

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions books on biblical and related topics sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of the book on the list is no indication of the editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it, unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Please address all books and related correspondence to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico. Piazza della Pilotta 35, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

Álvarez Barredo, Miguel, *El Libro de Jonás*. Criterios transversales, literarios y teológicos (Publicaciones del Instituto Teológico de Murcia, Serie Mayor 74). Murcia, Editorial Espigas, 2020. vii-295 p. 17 × 24. €20,00

Arnold, Matthieu – **Dahan**, Gilbert – **Noblesse-Rocher**, Annie (eds.), *1 Samuel 28. La nécromancienne d'En-Dor* (Études d'histoire de l'exégèse 16). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2021. vii-210 p. 13.5 × 21.5. €18,00

Byrne, Brendan, *Paul and the Economy of Salvation*. Reading from the Perspective of the Last Judgment. Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2021. xvi-286 p. 15 × 23.5. \$45.00

Carbajosa, Ignacio – **Muth**, Nicoletta Scotti (eds.), *Israel and the Cosmological Empires of the Ancient Orient*. Symbols of Order in Eric Voegelin's Order and History, Vol. I (Eric Voegelin Studies, Supplements 1). Leiden, Wilhelm Fink, 2021. vii-325 p. 17 × 24. €71,00

d'Hamonville, David-Marc, *Le cantique des cantiques* (Mon ABC de la Bible). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2021. v-149 p. 12.5 × 19.5. €12,00

Edzard, Lutz (ed.), *Bible Translations – Linguistic and Cultural Issues*. Proceedings of the Erlangen Workshop on October 5 and 6, 2018 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 122). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2021. v-197 p. 14.5 × 22. €48,00

Kahn, Dan'el, *Sennacherib's Campaign against Judah*. A Source Analysis of Isaiah 36–37 (Society for Old Testament Study Monographs). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2020. xxi-342 p. 15 × 22.5. £90.00

Kalimi, Isaac, *König Salomo*. Mensch und Mythos (Biblische Geschichtsschreibung im Wandel). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020. xv-357 p. 17 × 24. €80,20

Käsemann, Ernst, *Church Conflicts*. The Cross, Apocalyptic, and Political Resistance. Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2021. xxxiv-237 p. 15 × 23.5. \$40.00

Mayer, Gabriele, *Im Namen des Großen Lebens*. Johannes der Täufer im Johannesbuch der Mandäer (Mandäistische Forschungen 8). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2021. xi-303 p. 17 × 24. €76,10

Mourad, Anna-Latifa, *The Enigma of the Hyksos Volume II*. Transforming Egypt into the New Kingdom. The Impact of the Hyksos and Egyptian-Near Eastern Relations (Contributions to the Archaeology of Egypt, Nubia and the Levant 10). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2021. v-463 p. 21.5 × 30.5. €128,00